arXiv:math/0502077v1 [math.CA] 3 Feb 2005

On the existence of quasi-periodic lattice oscillations [*]

T. Kriecherbauer

Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We construct multi-phase travelling waves which are periodic in time and quasi-periodic in the spatial variable for infinite nonlinear chains with nearest neighbor interactions. Such solutions have been observed numerically in [17]. Their existence has so far been established only for linear systems and in the integrable case of the Toda lattice [43], [17]. For a general class of nonlinear chains one can show the existence of single-phase travelling waves using either perturbation theory [17] or topological methods [26]. For travelling waves with more than one phase, however, a small divisor problem occurs and the above mentioned constructions fail.

In this paper we prove a KAM-type theorem which yields the existence of a large family of multi-phase waves for a general class of chains. In fact, we show that most small amplitude travelling wave solutions of a linear system persist if a generic (analytic) nonlinearity is added to the force law (see theorems 2.19 and 16.32). Furthermore, we describe the exceptional set of nonlinear force laws which are not covered by our theorem. They form a countable collection of four-dimensional sub-manifolds in the space of real analytic functions.

During the past ten years a number of KAM theorems have been developed for infinite-dimensional systems (see e.g. [46], [56], [9], [4]). Although none of them implies our result, our proof uses many ideas introduced by Craig and Wayne [9] and further developed by Bourgain [4], [6]. In particular, we follow the analysis of [4] and [6]. In order to show our result the techniques of [4], [6] had to be modified and refined. For example, we extend the analysis of [4] to obtain enough control on the geometry of certain resonant sets such that the amplitude – frequency modulation, provided by the nonlinear dispersion relation, can be used to avoid strong resonances. Therefore we are not forced to introduce external parameters in our equation which would have no physical justification. Furthermore, we present proofs for a number of statements which were formulated in [4], [6] without proof.

---

[*] This paper was submitted as Habilitaionsschrift to the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München in 1999.

From a technical point of view the essential part of the proof is to control the inverse of families of matrices $T = D + R$ where D denotes a diagonal matrix and R is a Toeplitz matrix. Although the matrix R is small, it is not dominated by D due to the small divisor problem. To obtain estimates on T^{-1} one employs a multi-scale analysis which is similar to the one introduced by Fröhlich and Spencer [31] in the context of Anderson localization. We use a new version of the Fröhlich – Spencer technique containing ideas of Bourgain [4] and of the author [44].

Contents

1 The dynamics of nonlinear chains **4**

2 Statement of the main result **12**

3 Overview of the analysis **16**

4 Notation and definitions **34**

5 Fourier analysis **43**

6 The first induction step **49**

7 The induction statement for $j \geq 2$ **52**

8 The construction of v_{j+1} for $j = 1$ **54**

9 The construction of v_{j+1} for $j \geq 2$ **61**

10 Construction of the set of polynomials $\mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)}$ for $j \geq 1$ **71**

11 Completion of the induction step $j \rightarrow j + 1$ **99**

12 Solution of the $\mathcal{P}$ – equation **104**

13 Solution of the $\mathcal{Q}$-equation **106**

14 Estimates on the measure of the set of resonant parameters **111**

15 Proof of the main theorem 2.19 **120**

16 The assumptions of theorem 2.19 **121**

17 Weight functions **127**

18 Properties of the nonlinear part **129**

19 Properties of the linearized operators **131**

20 The coupling lemma **133**

21 A version of the Weierstrass Preparation Theorem **135**

22 An excision lemma **144**

23 The construction of $p \ominus q$ **145**

24 Remarks on the higher order chain rule **149**

25 Table of notation used in chapters II and III **155**

Chapter I

Introduction

1 The dynamics of nonlinear chains

In this paper we study the dynamics of nonlinear, infinite chains with nearest neighbor interactions which are governed by a system of differential equations of the form

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} x_n(t) = F(x_{n-1}(t) - x_n(t)) - F(x_n(t) - x_{n+1}(t)), \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{1.1}$$

The simplest physical model for such a system is a chain of particles each having unit mass, where neighboring particles are connected by identical springs. The displacement of the n-th particle at time t is described by $x_n(t)$. The force transmitted by each spring depends only on the distance of the corresponding particles and the force law is prescribed by the function F. In the case that the springs obey Hooke' s law the force F is a linear function with $F' > 0$. In this paper we will consider nonlinear force laws F which are strictly increasing functions. As one can easily see from (1.1) the monotonicity implies that F represents a restoring force, i.e. at all times the force on the n-th particle drives x_n toward the midpoint $(x_{n-1} + x_{n+1})/2$ of its neighboring particles.

Mechanical systems are not the only applications of (1.1). For example, there is a corresponding electric model of chains of coupled LC-circuits. In fact, lattice models are quite frequently used in solid state physics, nonlinear optics, material sciences, biology and chemistry (see [50], [63] and references therein). Also, from a mathematical point of view, lattice systems are of considerable interest. For example, they arise naturally in the numerical analysis of partial differential equations either by expanding the equation in a suitable basis in function space or by discretisation of the spatial variable.

Another attractive feature of lattice models is that they are usually easy to analyze numerically. They are therefore well suited to discover and study nonlinear effects for differential equations. In fact, this was the motivation for the well-known Fermi-Pasta-Ulam experiments [25]. Their rather unexpected findings became the starting point for many interesting investigations on the dynamics of nonlinear lattices. The idea of Fermi, Pasta and Ulam was to apply the emerging powers of the electronic computing machines to simple nonlinear problems which could not be treated analytically. As a first problem they chose to investigate the dynamics of chains of 65 particles for three different types of force laws. They assumed that the first particle x_0 and the last particle x_{64} are pinned, i.e. $x_0(t) = 0$, $x_{64}(t) = 0$ for all times. Recall that in the case of a linear force law $F(x) = \alpha x$, $\alpha > 0$, any initial value problem can be solved explicitly by expanding the solution in a basis of eigenmodes $s^{(k)}$, $c^{(k)}$, $1 \leq k \leq 63$, where

$$\begin{aligned} s_n^{(k)}(t) &= \sin(\lambda_k t)\sin(n\frac{k\pi}{64}), \quad c_n^{(k)}(t) = \cos(\lambda_k t)\sin(n\frac{k\pi}{64}), \quad \text{and} \\ \lambda_k &:= 2\sqrt{\alpha}\sin(\frac{k\pi}{128}). \end{aligned}$$

For linear systems energy is not exchanged between modes corresponding to different indices k. The general belief among physicists at the time of the FPU experiments was that the solutions of generic nonlinear systems exhibit ergodic behavior (ergodicity hypothesis). To study this effect Fermi, Pasta and Ulam decided to investigate thermalization, i.e. the exchange of energy between the (linear) eigenmodes which according to the ergodicity hypothesis should eventually lead to equidistribution of energy between all the modes. For three classes of nonlinear force laws F (linear + quadratic, linear + cubic, linear + piecewise linear) they studied the distribution of energy between the different modes, where at time $t = 0$ all energy was placed in the lowest eigenmode. They were surprised to find that thermalization did not occur. In fact, energy was only exchanged between a few modes and in a rather regular fashion. Moreover, after some intermediate time (at the order of about 100 cycles, i.e. $t \approx 100(2\pi/\lambda_1)$) the system was very close to its initial state. They concluded that the "prevalent beliefs in the universality of mixing and thermalization in nonlinear systems may not be always justified" [25]. Indeed, at almost the same time as the Fermi-Pasta-Ulam experiments were conducted the ergodicity hypothesis received another blow. Kolmogorov announced at the ICM 1954 his result which implies, roughly speaking, that there are open sets of Hamiltonian systems (in the neighborhood of completely integrable systems) for which the dynamics cannot be ergodic since there exist invariant sets of small but positive measure. Therefore ergodicity is not a generic property of nonlinear Hamiltonian systems. Since Fermi, Pasta and Ulam worked in a regime where the amplitudes and hence the effects of the nonlinearity were moderate it is conceivable [66] that they were observing traces of the quasi-periodic motion whose existence Kolmogorov had announced in 1954 (the details of the proof of Kolmogorov's result were subsequently given by Arnold in the analytic case and by Moser in the C^{∞} – case leading to what is now called KAM theory). It was later observed numerically (see [63]) that energy sharing between modes is enhanced by increasing the total energy of the system. However, until today no general result on the long time behavior of nonlinear Hamiltonian systems has been proved and despite a number of interesting examples and results the original questions of Fermi, Pasta and Ulam on ergodicity, mixing and thermalization of nonlinear conservative systems are not resolved.

The findings of Fermi, Pasta and Ulam led to a series of numerical studies by a number of people. One of the striking features which were observed was that nonlinear lattices allow not only the propagation of periodic waves but also the propagation of localized pulses (solitons), a genuinely nonlinear phenomenon. Although some of the numerical results could be explained by considering the Korteweg -de Vries equation as a continuum limit of the lattice equation there was hardly any rigorous analysis. In order to overcome the lack of analysis, Toda set out to find a particular nonlinear force law for which one could write down explicit travelling wave solutions. By some ingenious considerations [64] (see also [63]) he found that for $F(x) = e^x$ (Toda lattice) there exist periodic wave solutions which can be expressed in terms of elliptic functions. Toda's success was more thorough than one would have expected. Flaschka [27], [28] and independently Manakov [51] found that the Toda lattice belongs to the select class of completely integrable systems. Not only the dynamics of finite lattices can be analyzed completely (see e.g. [52]) but also the dynamics of infinite chains can be investigated via the inverse spectral transformation. As Toda had hoped, many rigorous results on the dynamics of the Toda lattice have been established, shedding light on the behavior of general nonlinear lattices. During the last ten years, motivated in part by the success of the Toda lattice, analytic results were also obtained for non-integrable lattices. Most of these results concern the propagation of waves. In the non-integrable case the main focus so far has been in establishing the existence of travelling wave solutions (as an exception see [29] for a remarkable stability result for solitons). In the integrable case, in contrast, one can analyze the long time behavior of solutions for a large class of initial value problems.

We will now describe some of the results obtained for nonlinear lattices. Hereby we restrict ourselves to infinite lattices with nearest neighbor interactions. In particular, our discussion will not include another famous lattice model, the Calogero – Moser lattice [7], [53] where all the particles interact with each other and which again constitutes an integrable system. Also, we will not discuss the dynamics of higher dimensional lattices (see [50] and references therein).

We start by briefly explaining the integrability of the Toda lattice as discovered by Flaschka [27] and Manakov [51]. We introduce Flaschka' s variables

$$a_n(t) := -\frac{\dot{x}_n(t)}{2}, \quad b_n(t) := \frac{1}{2} e^{\frac{1}{2}(x_n(t) - x_{n+1}(t))}.$$

Set $L(t)$ to be the symmetric tridiagonal matrix with entries $a_n(t)$ on the diagonal and off-diagonal entries $b_n(t)$. Furthermore, set $B(t) := L_+(t) - L_+^T(t)$ where L_+ denotes the upper triangular part of L. The equation for the Toda lattice can be written in Lax-pair form, i.e.

$$(x_n, \dot{x}_n) \text{ solves Toda } \Leftrightarrow \dot{L} = [B, L] \; (:= BL - LB).$$

The consequences of this observation are striking. It is not difficult to see that a family of operators $L(t)$ which satisfies $\dot{L}(t) = [B(t), L(t)]$ for some family of skew-symmetric operators $B(t)$ is unitarily equivalent, i.e. for every t there exists an unitary operator $Q(t)$ such that $L(t) = Q(t)L(0)Q^*(t)$. This implies in particular that the spectrum of $L(t)$ is independent of t. Moreover, recall that tridiagonal symmetric operators are determined by the spectrum together with a set of additional data (the first components of the eigenvectors in the matrix case, the auxiliary spectrum in the periodic case and scattering data in the case of infinite operators with entries a_n, b_n converging as $|n| \to \infty$). In all three cases one can show that *all* spectral data needed to reconstruct the operator $L(t)$ evolve simply in time and can be deduced from the corresponding data at time $t = 0$ by explicit formulae. This implies, for example, that we can use the spectral transformation to solve initial value problems. Starting with initial conditions $x_n(0)$, $\dot{x}_n(0)$ one defines the operator $L(0)$ via Flaschka's variables. Then one has to determine the spectral data for $L(0)$. The corresponding spectral data for $L(t)$ are obtained by explicit formulae. Applying the inverse spectral transformation yields the values for $x_n(t)$. Instead of solving a dynamics problem we now have to study the spectral transformation and its inverse. Such a remarkable method for solving nonlinear differential systems was first discovered through the pioneering work of Kruskal et al. [33] and Lax [49] for the Korteweg - de Vries equation. Nonlinear partial differential equations which can be written in Lax-pair form are often called integrable partial differential equations. There is quite a number of such equations (see e.g. [1]). In addition to the Toda lattice and the Korteweg – de Vries equation, the nonlinear Schrödinger equation and the Boussinesq equation belong to this class. It turned out that in the scattering case one can analyze the inverse spectral transformation very efficiently by formulating it as a matrix – valued Riemann – Hilbert problem. Deift and Zhou [20], [21] have introduced a nonlinear steepest descent – type method to analyze parameter dependent Riemann – Hilbert problems. Their technique was used and further developed in [12] – [16], [19], [2]. Matrix – valued Riemann – Hilbert problems not only appear in the theory of integrable systems but have recently been used to establish new asymptotic results in such diverse fields as statistical mechanics [12], combinatorics [2], orthogonal polynomials [11], [15], [45] and random matrix theory [14], [16].

Let us return to the results for the Toda lattice. In one direction, Deift and T-R McLaughlin [18] study the continuum limit of the Toda lattice. Their work yields an important case study to understand the relation between solutions of hyperbolic systems which develop shocks and the solutions of the corresponding spatially discretized systems. In another direction, towards an understanding of wave propagation in nonlinear lattices, the dynamics of driven semi-infinite lattices was analyzed. Since this particular class of initial boundary value problems is also the starting point for the present work, we explain it now in more detail.

Consider the following class of initial boundary value problems

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{x}_n(t) &= F(x_{n-1}(t) - x_n(t)) - F(x_n(t) - x_{n+1}(t)), \quad n \geq 1, \\ x_0(t) &= h(t), \quad t \geq 0 \\ x_n(0) - nd &= \mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha n}), \quad \dot{x}_n(0) = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha n}) \quad (d \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha > 0), \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

which describes the motion of a semi-infinite lattice which is driven from one end by particle x_0 of prescribed motion $h(t)$. In numerical experiments Holian and Straub [38] made a remarkable discovery. They investigated the shock problem where the driver moves toward the lattice at constant speed a (i.e. $h(t) = at$, $a > 0$). They observed that for a large class of nonlinear force laws F, there was a critical speed $a^* \in (0, \infty)$. For sub-critical driving speeds $0 < a < a^*$, the n-th particle $x_n(t) \to at + nd'$ as time $t \to \infty$. This means, in the frame of the driving particle the lattice eventually tends to a quiescent lattice with some new lattice spacing d'. On the other hand, for supercritical driving speeds ($a > a^*$) the particles, viewed again in the frame of the driver, keep oscillating for all times. The energy generated behind the shock front is never entirely dispersed. This effect is genuinely nonlinear; linear lattices exhibit sub-critical behavior for all driving speeds $a > 0$. In the case of the Toda lattice the shock problem could be analyzed in detail using integrability [37], [65], [40], [41]. In fact, not only the existence of a critical shock speed could be explained, but also a detailed description of the propagation of the shock, and of the region of modulated waves behind the shock was derived. More recently, the rarefaction problem was investigated as well. Here one withdraws the driver from the lattice at constant speed $a < 0$. Again there exists a critical speed $a_* \in (-\infty, 0)$. For sub-critical speeds $a_* < a < 0$ the lattice tends to a rarefied but quiescent lattice moving at the speed of the driver. For supercritical speeds $a < a_*$, however, the driver moves away from the bulk of the lattice which then behaves like a free semi-infinite lattice. The distances between neighboring particles tend to infinity at a logarithmic rate. For the Toda lattice this genuinely nonlinear behavior was established in [13] for the supercritical case.

Let us now assume that the driver in system (1.2) undergoes a periodic motion

$$h(t) = p(\gamma t), \tag{1.3}$$

where p denotes a 2π-periodic function and the parameter $\gamma > 0$ represents the frequency of the oscillations of the driver. Although the corresponding initial boundary value problem seems very similar to the shock and rarefaction problem described above, the crucial difference for the analysis is that the periodically driven semi-infinite lattice is not integrable for any nonlinear force law, including the Toda lattice. In [17] problem (1.2), (1.3) was studied numerically. We observed the following time asymptotic behavior. There exists a sequence of thresholds $\infty =: \gamma_0 > \gamma_1 > \gamma_2 > \ldots > 0$, such that for driving frequencies $\gamma_\nu > \gamma > \gamma_{\nu+1}$ the solutions of (1.2), (1.3) are well described by travelling ν-phase waves, as time becomes large, except for a boundary layer close to the driver. More precisely, there exists a function χ defined on the ν-dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}^\nu \equiv (\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})^\nu$ and real numbers $\tilde{d}$, $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\nu$ such that for t/n large

$$x_n(t) \approx x_n^{as}(t) \equiv \tilde{d}n + \chi(\omega_1 n - \gamma t, \omega_2 n - 2\gamma t, \ldots, \omega_\nu n - \nu\gamma t) + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta n}), \quad n \geq 1,$$

for some $\beta > 0$. One of the goals of [17] was to construct the numerically observed limit cycles x^{as} for small amplitudes of the driving function h by perturbative methods. It turned out that the main difficulty in the construction were resonances ($l\gamma$ is contained in the continuous spectrum of some associated linearized operator for $l = 0, \pm 1, \ldots, \pm\nu$) leading to an over-determined equation. In order to overcome this problem it was necessary to obtain sufficiently ample families of travelling wave solutions of the *doubly infinite lattice*, i.e. solutions of the form

$$x_n(t) = \chi(\omega_1 n - \gamma t, \omega_2 n - 2\gamma t, \ldots, \omega_\nu n - \nu\gamma t), \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}, \tag{1.4}$$

where again χ is a function on the ν – dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}^\nu$. In the case $\nu = 1$ such families of travelling wave solutions (with small amplitudes) can be constructed by a standard Lyapunov –

Schmidt reduction argument (see [17]). However, for $\nu \geq 2$ a small divisor problem occurs. It is the goal of the present paper to overcome this small divisor problem and to show that for generic nonlinear real analytic force laws F there exist uncountably many solutions of (1.1) of type (1.4). Note that for linear lattices such solutions can be obtained by a simple superposition of travelling one-phase waves (see section 2.1 below) and in the case of the Toda lattice ($F(x) = e^x$) such solutions can be expressed explicitly in terms of theta-functions (see [43], [17]).

Small divisor problems have a long history in the theory of nonlinear dynamical systems. In fact, many investigations in the field of celestial mechanics were aimed at understanding the effects of resonances or near resonances which are the physical reason behind the occurrence of small divisors (see [3] for the history of the three body problem in celestial mechanics). A general method to overcome such problems was presented only in the middle of this century, when the above mentioned KAM theory was developed for finite dimensional Hamiltonian systems. The basic idea is to use a rapidly converging iteration scheme to balance the effects of the small divisors. In recent years this idea has also been extended to infinite dimensional systems, establishing the existence of finite dimensional invariant tori. In infinite dimensions, two somewhat different methods have been most successful. The first method, developed by Kuksin [46] and Pöschel [56] (see also [47], [57]) extends the classical approach of KAM-theory to iteratively construct a normal form using a sequence of symplectic transformations (cf. [24], [54], [67]). The second method, introduced by Craig and Wayne in [9], uses Fourier analysis to obtain a nonlinear equation on a lattice. They apply a Lyapunov – Schmidt reduction to this equation. The infinite dimensional part of the reduction contains the small divisor problem which is overcome by a modified Newton scheme in the spirit of the Nash – Moser technique. The main difficulty in this procedure lies in inverting matrices of the form $D + R$, where D is a diagonal matrix dominating R, *except* for some diagonal entries $D(n, n)$ of small absolute values which represent the small divisors. The lattice sites n where $|D(n, n)|$ is of order $\mathcal{O}(|R|)$ are called singular sites. To control $(D + R)^{-1}$ the separation of singular sites plays an important role. In the work of Craig and Wayne the existence of families of time-periodic solutions was established for $(1 + 1)$ – dimensional nonlinear wave equations [9] and for $(1 + 1)$-dimensional nonlinear Schrödinger equations [10]. For the construction of quasi-periodic solutions (in time), however, the singular sites are less separated and a new idea was needed. Such an idea was provided by Bourgain [4] who introduced a multi-scale analysis to overcome this difficulty. He established the existence of quasi-periodic solutions for $(1 + 1)$ – dimensional wave equations [4] and for $(1+1)$ – and $(1+2)$ – dimensional nonlinear Schrödinger equations [4], [6] (cf. [5] for a finite dimensional application of his technique). The estimates on the inverse matrices $(D+R)^{-1}$ in the work of Craig – Wayne and in the work of Bourgain are based on a technique which was first introduced by Fröhlich and Spencer [31] in the theory of Anderson localization, where similar inversion problems occur. Note furthermore that the idea of using a Lyapunov-Schmidt reduction to prove the existence of quasi-periodic solutions was already used by Scheurle [58], [59] in the context of finite dimensional systems.

In our proof of the existence of travelling multi-phase waves we follow the construction of Bourgain [4]. In order to obtain our result we will modify and refine his method at various points. Hereby an important role is played by a new version of the coupling lemma in the Fröhlich – Spencer technique which the author first presented in [44]. A more detailed description of our proof will be given in section 3 after the statement of the main result in section 2.

We conclude this section by briefly describing related results on the existence of travelling waves in nonlinear (non-integrable) infinite chains with nearest neighbor interactions. In contrast to our theorem, all results obtained previously concern the construction of one-phase travelling waves

$$x_n(t) = \chi(\omega n - \gamma t). \tag{1.5}$$

These results are either of perturbative nature (i.e. small amplitude solutions) or they are derived by variational methods. The existence of solitary travelling wave solutions with prescribed potential energy was shown by Friesecke and Wattis [30] for a large class of force laws. Later Smets and Willem [61] used a different variational formulation to construct solitary waves with given wave speeds (see [60] for extensions). Periodic travelling waves were constructed by Filip and Venakides [26]. All of the just mentioned results do not require smallness of the solutions.

Regarding small amplitude solutions the above mentioned paper of Friesecke and Pego [29] yields a remarkably detailed analysis of solitary waves at near sonic speeds, including their stability properties. Small amplitude periodic travelling waves were constructed by Deift, Kriecherbauer, Venakides in [17]. Georgieva, Kriecherbauer and Venakides [34], [35] have extended the analysis of [17] to diatomic chains with periodically varying masses (of period 2) discovering interesting resonance phenomena which might provide a mechanism for frequency doubling.

Finally, we mention that the existence of travelling single-phase waves has also been established for a related system of coupled oscillators which is described by

$$\ddot{x}_n = x_{n-1} + f(x_n) + x_{n+1}. \tag{1.6}$$

A general and powerful method to determine all (small amplitude) solutions of (1.6) of the form (1.5) was recently presented by Iooss and Kirchgässner [39]. They use their technique to construct solutions with interesting and unexpected profile functions χ.

2 Statement of the main result

In this section we formulate our main result. We will construct solutions of

$$\ddot{x}_n(t) = F(x_{n-1}(t) - x_n(t)) - F(x_n(t) - x_{n+1}(t)), \ \ n \in \mathbb{Z}, \ t \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{2.1}$$

which are of the form

$$x_n(t) = nb + \chi(n\omega_1 - \gamma t, \dots, n\omega_\nu - \nu\gamma t) \tag{2.2}$$

for some $\nu \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$, b, γ, $\omega_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\chi : (\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})^\nu \equiv \mathbb{T}^\nu \to \mathbb{R}$. Solutions of this form describe time-periodic travelling multi-phase waves where ν denotes the number of phases. As explained in section 1 there is numerical evidence [17] that such solutions exist for a large class of force laws F. Note that we exclude the case $\nu = 1$ from our considerations because in this case there is no small divisor problem and the existence of periodic single-phase waves has already been proved in [17]. Roughly speaking, our main result shows that for generic analytic force laws F, sufficiently low frequencies $\gamma > 0$ and most values of averaged lattice spacings b there exist uncountably many solutions of type (2.2) with small amplitudes. These solutions can be parameterized smoothly by $z \in \mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{C}^\nu$ where $\mathcal{Z}$ is a set of relative large measure in a neighborhood of the origin. In the following we will make this statement precise. In order to understand the origin of this class of travelling waves we first discuss the linear case.

2.1 The linear lattice

Suppose $F(x) = \alpha x$ with $\alpha > 0$. A function

$$x_n(t) = e^{i(\omega n - \gamma t)} \tag{2.3}$$

solves (2.1) if and only if the frequencies γ and ω satisfy the following dispersion relation

$$\gamma^2 = 4\alpha \sin^2 \frac{\omega}{2}. \tag{2.4}$$

For given $\gamma > 0$ there exists an unique $\nu \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with

$$(\nu\gamma)^2 \leq 4\alpha < ((\nu+1)\gamma)^2. \tag{2.5}$$

Note that in the case $\nu = 0$ (i.e. $\gamma > 2\sqrt{\alpha}$) no bounded solution of (2.1) of the form (2.3) exists. Assume $\nu \geq 1$ and define

$$\omega_j^{(0)} := 2 \arcsin\left(\frac{j\gamma}{2\sqrt{\alpha}}\right) \in (0, \pi] \quad \text{for } j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}. \tag{2.6}$$

For $z \in \mathbb{C}^\nu$, $b \in \mathbb{R}$ set

$$\begin{aligned}
x_n(t; b, z) &:= nb + \chi_z^{(lin)}(\omega^{(0)} n - g\gamma t), \quad \text{where} && (2.7)\\
\chi_z^{(lin)} &: \mathbb{T}^\nu \to \mathbb{R}, \ \chi_z^{(lin)}(\xi) = \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} (z_j e^{i\xi_j} + \overline{z_j} e^{-i\xi_j}), && (2.8)\\
\omega^{(0)} &:= (\omega_1^{(0)}, \dots, \omega_\nu^{(0)}), && (2.9)\\
g &:= (1, 2, \dots, \nu). && (2.10)
\end{aligned}$$

The functions $(x_n(\cdot\,; b, z))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ provide a family of solutions of (2.1) of type (2.2).

2.2 Assumptions

In this section we state four assumptions which will constitute the hypothesis of our main theorem 2.19. They concern the force law F, the averaged lattice spacing b and the (time-) frequency γ.

Assumption A1: *F is real analytic in a neighborhood of $-b$ with $F'(-b) > 0$.*

Assumption A2: *$0 < \gamma < \sqrt{F'(-b)}$ and $2\sqrt{F'(-b)} \notin \gamma\mathbb{Z}$.*

Assumption A2 implies the existence of $\nu \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$ satisfying

$$\nu\gamma < 2\sqrt{F'(-b)} < (\nu+1)\gamma. \tag{2.11}$$

We set

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega_j^{(0)} &:= 2 \arcsin\left(\frac{j\gamma}{2\sqrt{F'(-b)}}\right) \in (0, \pi) \quad \text{for } j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}. && (2.12)\\
\omega^{(0)} &:= (\omega_1^{(0)}, \dots, \omega_\nu^{(0)}), && (2.13)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that these definitions are consistent with the corresponding definitions in section 2.1.

Assumption A3 *(diophantine condition): There exist positive constants s and τ such that*

$$dist(<\omega^{(0)}, m>, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) > \frac{s}{|m|^\tau} \qquad \textit{for all } m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus \{0\}. \tag{2.14}$$

We have used the notation $<a, b>= \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} a_i b_i$ for a, $b \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$. Before we can state assumption A4, we need a few more definitions.

$$\Lambda_j := \frac{(j\gamma)^2 \cos(\frac{\omega_j^{(0)}}{2})}{4\sin^3(\frac{\omega_j^{(0)}}{2})}, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \nu. \tag{2.15}$$

Recall the definition of the integer vector g in (2.10). For $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$ we set

$$V(\omega)(m) := \begin{cases} F'(-b) & \text{if } <g, m>= 0 \\ F'(-b) - \frac{<g,m>^2\gamma^2}{4\sin^2\frac{<\omega,m>}{2}} & \text{else .} \end{cases} \tag{2.16}$$

Here we understand $V(\omega)(m) = \infty$ in the case $<g, m>\neq 0$ and $<\omega, m>\in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. Denote by

$$e_j := (0, \ldots, 0, 1, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu. \tag{2.17}$$

Set $\Omega^{(\nu)} \equiv \Omega$ to be the $\nu \times \nu$ matrix with entries

$$\Omega_{j,l}^{(\nu)} \equiv \Omega_{j,l} := \begin{cases} 3\Lambda_l^{-1}\left(F''(-b)^2 \frac{1}{V(\omega^{(0)})(2e_l)} - F'''(-b)\right) & \text{if } j = l, \\ 2\Lambda_l^{-1}\left(F''(-b)^2\left(\frac{1}{V(\omega^{(0)})(e_j+e_l)} + \frac{1}{V(\omega^{(0)})(e_j-e_l)}\right) - F'''(-b)\right) & \text{if } j \neq l. \end{cases} \tag{2.18}$$

It is shown in lemma 16.1 that the entries of Ω are well defined real numbers.

Assumption A4 *(non-degeneracy condition): No entry of Ω vanishes and* $\det\Omega \neq 0$.

In theorem 16.32 we formulate and prove our claim that assumptions A1 – A4 are generically satisfied.

2.3 The Theorem

Theorem 2.19 *Suppose $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfy assumptions A1 – A4. Let g, ν, $\omega^{(0)}$ be defined as in (2.10) – (2.13) above and let $0 < \kappa < 1$. Then there exist $\rho > 0$, a measurable set $\mathcal{Z} \subset U_\rho(0) \equiv \{z \in \mathbb{C}^\nu : |z_j| < \rho\ ,\ 1 \leq j \leq \nu\}$ and functions $\omega : U_\rho(0) \to \mathbb{R}^\nu$, $\chi : \mathbb{T}^\nu \times U_\rho(0) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for every $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ the functions*

$$x_n(t) = nb + \chi(\omega(z)n - g\gamma t, z) \qquad n \in \mathbb{Z},\ t \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{2.20}$$

define solutions of system (2.1) of type (2.2) and statements (2.21) – (2.24) below hold.

$$vol(\mathcal{Z}) \geq \kappa \; vol(U_\rho(0)) \quad \textit{(volume with respect to Lebesgue measure in } \mathbb{R}^{2\nu}\textit{)}, \tag{2.21}$$

$$\textit{the map } z \mapsto \chi(\cdot, z) \textit{ is one to one }, \tag{2.22}$$

$$|\omega(z) - \omega^{(0)}| = \mathcal{O}(|z|^2), \tag{2.23}$$

$$\sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{T}^\nu} \left| \chi(\xi, z) - \chi_{z'}^{(lin)}(\xi) \right| = \mathcal{O}(|z|^2), \quad \textit{(see (2.8)) and where for } z \in U_\rho(0) \tag{2.24}$$

$$z' := \frac{i\sqrt{F'(-b)}}{\gamma} \left(\frac{z_1}{1}, \frac{z_2}{2}, \ldots, \frac{z_\nu}{\nu} \right). \tag{2.25}$$

Remark 2.26 Theorem 2.19 together with theorem 16.32 implies that most small amplitude travelling wave solutions (2.7) of the linear system persist if generic higher order terms are added to the force law. The profile function $\chi(\cdot, z)$ as well as the frequency vector $\omega(z)$ differ from the corresponding linear quantities only to order $|z|^2$, where $|z|$ is a measure of the amplitude of the oscillations (see (2.23) and (2.24)). Statements (2.21) and (2.22) imply that we have constructed uncountably many solutions of (2.1) of type (2.2).

Remark 2.27 We have required in assumption $A1$ that the force law is analytic. This will ensure rapid decay on the sequence of Fourier coefficients. As in classical KAM theory one might expect that it suffices to assume some finite regularity. A first step to support this view for infinite dimensional systems has been taken in [8]. In this paper we do not investigate the question of minimal regularity and treat only the analytic case. The second assumption in A1, $F'(-b) > 0$ is necessary for the existence of (bounded) travelling waves in the linear case as the analysis of section 2.1 shows. Recall from the first paragraph of section 1 that this assumption also has the physical interpretation that F represents a restoring forces on the lattice.

Assumption $A2$ can again be understood from the linear case. It implies that the linearized equation carries multi-phase waves with two or more phases. Furthermore, assumption A2 excludes those frequencies where the number ν of phases changes.

The diophantine assumption $A3$ implies that small divisors do not appear for low Fourier modes. Such a condition (possibly in a weaker form) is needed to start the Newton iteration scheme.

Assumption $A4$ will be used to show that the nonlinear dispersion relation $\omega(z)$ is not degenerate to second order. This implies, roughly speaking, that the dependence of $\omega(z)$ on z is sufficiently large to ensure that we can avoid resonant parameters $(z, \omega(z))$ by small changes in z.

3 Overview of the analysis

Our proof of theorem 2.19 is based on a method which was first introduced by Craig and Wayne to construct Cantor families of time-periodic, small amplitude solutions for nonlinear wave equations [9] and for nonlinear Schrödinger equations [10], where the spatial variable lives on a finite interval and either Dirichlet or periodic boundary conditions are prescribed. The basic strategy of Craig and Wayne is to expand the solution with respect to the eigenfunction basis of the corresponding linearized operator. This leads to a nonlinear equation on a two-dimensional lattice. Then they apply a Lyapunov – Schmidt reduction. The small divisor problem is contained in the infinite dimensional part of the reduction. In order to solve this equation Craig and Wayne devise a modified Newton scheme in the spirit of Nash – Moser implicit function theorems. At each step of the iteration scheme the crucial difficulty lies in deriving estimates on the inverse of matrices $T(\lambda)$ where λ denotes a parameter. More precisely, at the $k-th$ step of the iteration $T_k(\lambda)$ represents a family of $L_k \times L_k$ matrices (L_k grows exponentially with k) and one has to show that, except for a small set of parameters λ, the inverse matrices $T_k^{-1}(\lambda)$ can be bounded in a suitable norm by $\Phi(L_k)$ for some function Φ of sub-exponential growth at ∞ (e.g. Φ polynomial). The matrices $T_k(\lambda)$ are of the form $D+R$, where D is a diagonal matrix and R is small with respect to some norm. Clearly, if the entries of the diagonal matrix D were bounded away from zero and R were sufficiently small such that $\|D^{-1}R\| < 1$, i.e. if we were in the case of diagonal dominance, the inverse of $D + R$ would exist and could be expanded in a Neumann series. However, the existence of small divisors is reflected in the fact that for all parameter values λ the matrices $T_k(\lambda)$ have diagonal entries $T_k(\lambda)(n, n)$ of small absolute value and we are therefore *not* in the case of diagonal dominance. The corresponding lattice points n with $|T_k(\lambda)(n, n)| = \mathcal{O}(|R|)$ are called singular sites. The location of these singular sites, in particular their mutual distances, determines how difficult it is to obtain the required estimates on $T_k^{-1}(\lambda)$, if it is possible at all. In [9], [10] Craig and Wayne proved that for most parameter values λ, singular sites n (respectively clusters of two singular sites) are well separated. As a consequence the effects of different singular sites decouple, i.e. one can restrict oneself to investigating submatrices of $T_k(\lambda)$ which contain at most one singular site (respectively one cluster of singular sites). The inverse of such submatrices can be controlled by studying the dependence of their small eigenvalues on λ.

For the construction of quasi-periodic solutions, however, there is less separation of singular sites than in the periodic case. This has the effect that clusters of singular sites cannot be decoupled.

The analysis of Craig and Wayne had to be developed further. This was done by Bourgain who added a multi-scale analysis to the procedure of Craig and Wayne. Bourgain was able to prove the existence of quasi-periodic solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations and nonlinear wave equations [4], [6].

The results of Craig – Wayne and Bourgain are based in some form on proving exponential localization of the eigenvectors corresponding to small eigenvalues. A powerful technique for proving such localization results for a similar class of operators was introduced by Fröhlich and Spencer [31] in the theory of Anderson localization. Their method has been used and further developed by many authors (see e.g. [23], [32], [55], [62], [9], [4], [36], [6], [44]) including the above mentioned work of Craig – Wayne and Bourgain.

In the remainder of this section we explain in more detail how the method of Craig – Wayne and Bourgain can be used to prove theorem 2.19. In order to keep the overview of the analysis as non-technical as possible we will introduce some simplifications. In remarks 3.28 3.30, 3.35, 3.39 below we describe the modifications which are necessary to treat the full problem. At the end of this section we outline the plan of this paper.

The first step of our analysis is to perform a Fourier transformation of the equation. To this end we expand the function $\chi(\cdot, z)$ (see (2.20))

$$\chi(\xi, z) = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} \tilde{u}_m(z) e^{i<m,\xi>} = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} \frac{u_m(z)}{-2i\sin(<\omega(z), m>/2)} e^{i<m,\xi>}.$$

Note that we will work with the modified Fourier coefficients $u_m(z)$ rather than with the sequence $\tilde{u}_m(z)$ itself, mainly for the reason that the nonlinear part of the equation takes a simpler form when regarded as a function of (u_m). The letter z denotes a parameter of the construction. The interpretation of this parameter is given by the relation

$$u_{e_j}(z) = z_j, \quad 1 \le j \le \nu,$$

which will hold by definition. It is our task to determine the nonlinear dispersion relation $\omega(z)$ and the sequence of modified Fourier coefficients $(u_m(z))_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu}$, for a large family of parameters $z \in \mathbb{C}^\nu$, in such a way that the corresponding multi-phase waves (defined through (2.20)) solve equation (2.1). In section 5 below we derive the equations for ω and (u_m) (see proposition 5.22) which can be written in the form

$$(D(\omega)u + W(u))_m = 0 \quad \text{for } m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus \{0\}. \tag{3.1}$$

Here $D(\omega)$ denotes a diagonal matrix,

$$D(\omega)(m,n) = \delta_{m,n}\left(F'(-b) - \frac{\gamma^2 < m, g >^2}{4\sin^2\frac{<\omega,m>}{2}}\right), \tag{3.2}$$

and represents the linearized equation, whereas $W(u)$ contains the nonlinear part of the equation with $W(u) = \mathcal{O}(|u|^2)$. Observe that $D(\omega)(m,m)$ is not defined for $< \omega, m > \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. As it turns out this causes only minor difficulties in our analysis (see remark 3.39 below). In case $< \omega, m > \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ we shall define $D(\omega)(m,m) = \infty$ if $< m, g > \neq 0$, and $D(\omega)(m,m) = F'(-b)$ if $< m, g >= 0$. Using the symmetries of the system (see remark 3.28) we may restrict ourselves to search for solutions $(u_m)_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} \equiv (u(m))_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu}$ of (3.1) which lie in the set

$$\{u : \mathbb{Z}^\nu \to \mathbb{C} \ : \ u(0) = 0,\ u(m) = u(-m) \in \mathbb{R} \ \text{ for } m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu\}. \tag{3.3}$$

In order to apply a Lyapunov – Schmidt reduction to (3.1) we determine the kernel of the diagonal operator $D(\omega^{(0)})$ where $\omega^{(0)}$ (see (2.12), (2.13)) satisfies the dispersion relations of the linearized equation. It follows from the definition of $\omega^{(0)}$ that $D(\omega^{(0)})(m,m) = 0$ for all $m \in \mathcal{S}$ where

$$\mathcal{S} := \{e_j, -e_j : 1 \le j \le \nu\}. \tag{3.4}$$

In order to show that $D(\omega^{(0)})(m,m) \neq 0$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus \mathcal{S}$ one needs to employ the diophantine condition of assumption A3. Hence the dimension of the kernel of $D(\omega^{(0)})$ is 2ν and

$$\ker D(\omega^{(0)}) = \{u : u(m) = 0 \text{ for } m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus \mathcal{S}\}.$$

Define Q to be the projection on the kernel

$$(Qu)(m) := \begin{cases} u(m) & \text{if } m \in \mathcal{S}, \\ 0 & \text{else .} \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

We denote by P the complementary projection

$$(Pu)(m) := \begin{cases} u(m) & \text{if } m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus (\mathcal{S} \cup \{0\}), \\ 0 & \text{if } m \in \mathcal{S} \cup \{0\}. \end{cases} \tag{3.6}$$

Note that $P = Id - Q$ holds for all sequence spaces which require $u(0) = 0$. Since we look for solutions in such a class (see (3.3)) we may decompose

$$u = Qu + Pu \equiv x + v.$$

With this notation one can write equation (3.1) in the following way

$$D(\omega)x + QW(x+v) = 0 \qquad (\text{Q} - \text{equation}), \tag{3.7}$$

$$D(\omega)v + PW(x+v) = 0 \qquad (\text{P} - \text{equation}). \tag{3.8}$$

In a standard Lyapunov – Schmidt reduction the operator $D(\omega^{(0)})$ has a bounded inverse on the P – projection of the space. Therefore the second equation can be solved by the implicit function theorem which determines $v = v(x,\omega)$ as a function of x and ω. Inserting $v(x,\omega)$ into the first equation one obtains a degenerate, finite dimensional equation depending only on x and ω. This equation is often called the bifurcation equation. Typically, the bifurcation equation can be solved by determining the nonlinear dispersion relation $\omega = \omega(x)$. In this way one has constructed a family of solutions, parameterized by (small) x which correspond to solutions of the linearized equation. This procedure works without any difficulties in the case $\nu = 1$ leading to small amplitude single-phase travelling waves [17]. However, in the case $\nu \geq 2$ considered in this paper it is clear from (3.2) that $D(\omega^{(0)})$ does not have a bounded inverse on the P – projected space because the diagonal entries of $D(\omega^{(0)})$ accumulate at 0, reflecting the small divisor problem. As a result we will not be able to solve the P – equation for all values (x,ω) in a neighborhood of $(0,\omega^{(0)})$ but for a Cantor – type subset $\mathcal{N}^\infty$ of relative large measure. Since we also need to satisfy the bifurcation equation (3.7), not only the measure but also the geometry of the set $\mathcal{N}^\infty$ must be controlled. Indeed, we have to show that the subset $\{(x,\omega(x)) : x \text{ small }\}$ of codimension ν lies in $\mathcal{N}^\infty$ for most values of x.

We now describe the analysis of the P – equation in more detail. In the reduced space (3.3) we can parameterize the kernel of $D(\omega^{(0)})$ by $\varphi(a)$, $a \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$, where

$$\varphi(a)(m) := \begin{cases} a_j & \text{if } m \in \{e_j, -e_j\} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \tag{3.9}$$

Furthermore we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &:= (a,\omega), && (3.10)\\ \lambda^{(0)} &:= (0,\omega^{(0)}), && (3.11)\\ \mathcal{Q}(v,\lambda) &:= D(\omega)\varphi(a) + QW(\varphi(a)+v), && (3.12)\\ \mathcal{P}(v,\lambda) &:= D(\omega)v + PW(\varphi(a)+v). && (3.13) \end{aligned}$$

Chapter II is devoted to solving the P – equation. More precisely, we show that there exist a positive number ρ_1, a smooth function $v(\lambda)$, defined for $\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^{(1)} \equiv B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)})$, and a subset $\mathcal{N}^{\infty}$ of $\mathcal{N}^{(1)}$ such that $v(\lambda) = Pv(\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{P}(v(\lambda), \lambda) = 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^{\infty}$ (cf. theorem 12.4). Following Craig and Wayne we construct v by a modified Newton scheme, $v := \lim_{j \to \infty} v_j$ where

$$\begin{aligned} v_1(\lambda) &= 0, \\ v_{j+1}(\lambda) &= v_j(\lambda) - T_j^{-1}(\lambda)\mathcal{P}(v_j(\lambda), \lambda), \quad \text{with} \\ T_j(\lambda) &= [D(\omega) + DW(\varphi(a) + v_j(\lambda)]|_{\Lambda_j} \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

and Λ_j is a nested sequence of finite lattices exhausting the set $\mathbb{Z}^{\nu} \setminus (\{0\} \cup \mathcal{S})$. Roughly speaking, if one can show that $T_j^{-1}(\lambda)$ is bounded by $\Phi(\#\Lambda_j)$ in a suitable norm for some function Φ of sub-exponential growth at infinity (e.g. Φ polynomial) and $\#\Lambda_j$ grows exponentially with j, then the sequence $v_j(\lambda)$ will converge to some function $v(\lambda)$ which solves $\mathcal{P}(v(\lambda), \lambda) = 0$. Note that the modification of the Newton scheme consists in restricting the linearized operator T_j to some sub-lattice. The truncation of the high Fourier modes corresponds to the regularization operations used in the Nash – Moser technique. The error introduced by this modification of the Newton scheme can be controlled employing the decay of the sequences $v_j(m)$ (in m). The decay of the v_j's stems from the regularity of the equation. To this end we have required in assumption A1 the force law to be analytic. In a recent paper Craig and Su [8] have shown in the case of time-periodic solutions of (1+1) – dimensional nonlinear wave equations that analyticity can be replaced by some finite regularity assumption. This suggests that the method of Craig and Wayne can generally be extended to the non-analytic case. However, we will not pursue the question of minimal regularity in this paper.

The main difficulty of the iteration scheme (3.14) is to prove the existence of the inverse matrix $T_j^{-1}(\lambda)$ and to derive the corresponding bounds. It is clear that such bounds cannot hold uniformly for all values of the parameter $\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^{(1)}$. Even for the diagonal operator $D(\omega)$ estimates on the inverse matrices $|(D|_{\Lambda_j})^{-1}(\omega)| \leq \Phi(\#\Lambda_j)$ require some diophantine conditions on ω. Such conditions cannot hold in any open neighborhood of $\omega^{(0)}$. Therefore we may only expect to bound $T_j^{-1}(\lambda)$ for λ belonging to some subset $\mathcal{N}^{(j)} \subset \mathcal{N}^{(1)}$. Definition (3.14) only applies for $\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^{(j)}$. For technical reasons we will extend v_{j+1} to a smooth function on all of $\mathcal{N}^{(1)}$ but for values $\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^{(1)} \setminus \mathcal{N}^{(j)}$ we cannot control $|\mathcal{P}(v_{j+1}(\lambda), \lambda)|$. The sets of good parameters $\mathcal{N}^{(j)}$ form a nested sequence and $\mathcal{N}^{\infty}$ denotes the intersection of all these sets.

We determine the sets $\mathcal{N}^{(j)}$ of good parameters and the estimates on $T_j^{-1}(\lambda)$ by a multi-scale analysis similar to the one used by Bourgain [4]. In order to explain the multi-scale analysis we consider a class of matrices which have a similar structure as the matrices $T_j(\lambda)$ but which are easier to analyze. We show in remark 3.30 below how to modify the argument to treat the case at hand. Set

$$T(\omega)(m,n) = (<\omega, m>)\delta_{m,n} + r(m-n), \quad m,n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu. \tag{3.15}$$

Here r denotes a sequence on $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$ which has small norm and $r(m) \to 0$ for $|m| \to \infty$ at a sufficiently fast rate. Observe that the matrices $T(\omega)$ are of the form $D + R$ where D is diagonal and R is a Toeplitz matrix with entries decaying rapidly with the distance from the diagonal. These are exactly the properties which are shared by the matrices $T_j(\lambda)$ (see (3.14)) and which are basic requirements for a multi-scale analysis.

The main idea behind the multi-scale analysis, which was first introduced by Fröhlich and Spencer [31], can be described in the following way. Denote by $N_1 < N_2 < N_3 < \ldots$ a suitably chosen sequence of length scales and fix a suitable function $\Phi(x)$ of sub-exponential growth at infinity. For fixed parameter ω we say that a lattice site $n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ is ω-moderate at scale j, if

$$\|T(\omega)|_{B_{N_j}(n)}^{-1}\| \leq M_j \equiv \Phi(N_j)$$

where $B_{N_j}(n) = \{m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu : |m-n| < N_j\}$ and $\|\cdot\|$ denotes a suitable weighted operator norm (which will depend on j). To see the significance of this definition assume that Λ is some sub-lattice of $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$ and suppose that there exists an integer j_0 such that each $n \in \Lambda$ is ω-moderate at some scale $1 \leq j \leq j_0$. Then one can construct an inverse of the restricted matrix $T(\omega)|_\Lambda$ and the bound on the inverse is roughly given by M_{j_0}. In other words, we can paste together the local inverse matrices $T(\omega)|_{B_{N_j}(n)}^{-1}$ to a global inverse $T(\omega)|_\Lambda^{-1}$. In section 20 we state a recent version of the coupling lemma (lemma 20.1) which was introduced by the author in [44]. The hypothesis of the coupling lemma essentially requires that $r(|m|)$ decays faster than $(\Phi(|m|))^{-1}$. This implies that for a site n which is ω-moderate at scale j the product of M_j (the bound on $\|T(\omega)|_{B_{N_j}(n)}^{-1}\|$) with the interaction term $|R(m,n)| = |r(m-n)|$ is small for any lattice site m in $\Lambda \setminus B_{N_j}(n)$. Observe that lemma 20.1 also requires that the neighborhoods $B_{N_j}(n)$ are contained in the set Λ. We address this issue in remark 3.35 below.

Of course, the question remains how to establish that a lattice point is ω-moderate at some scale. Here we again use the special structure of the matrix $T(\omega)$ which implies

$$T(\omega)(m+k,n+k)=\delta_{m,n}(<\omega,k>)+T(\omega)(m,n). \tag{3.16}$$

This motivates the introduction of a new parameter. For $\theta\in\mathbb{R}$ define

$$T(\theta,\omega)(m,n):=(\theta+<\omega,m>)\delta_{m,n}+r(m-n),\quad m,n\in\mathbb{Z}^{\nu}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} T(0,\omega) &= T(\omega), && (3.17)\\ T(\theta,\omega)(m+k,n+k) &= T(\theta+<\omega,k>,\omega)(m,n). && (3.18)\end{aligned}$$

Relation (3.18) implies that at each scale j it suffices to investigate the invertibility of $T(\theta,\omega)|_{B_{N_j}(0)}$ for all $\theta\in\mathbb{R}$, since

$$T(\omega)|_{B_{N_j}(n)}=T(<\omega,n>,\omega)|_{B_{N_j}(0)}. \tag{3.19}$$

Denote $\Gamma_j:=B_{N_j}(0)$. Our goal to determine whether a site n is ω-moderate can be expressed in the following way. Construct a nested sequence of sets

$$\mathbb{R}\supset I_{\omega}^{(1)}\supset I_{\omega}^{(2)}\supset\dots\ ,$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(\theta,\omega)|_{\Gamma_1}^{-1}\| &\le M_1 && \text{if } \theta\in\mathbb{R}\setminus I_{\omega}^{(1)}, && (3.20)\\ \|T(\theta,\omega)|_{\Gamma_j}^{-1}\| &\le M_j && \text{if } \theta\in I_{\omega}^{(j-1)}\setminus I_{\omega}^{(j)},\ \ j\ge 2. && (3.21)\end{aligned}$$

By (3.19) a site n is ω-moderate for some scale $1\le j\le j_0$ if $<n,\omega>\in\mathbb{R}\setminus I_{\omega}^{(j_0)}$. Now the objective is to construct the sets $I_{\omega}^{(j)}$ and to control the location and measure of these sets. The sets $I_{\omega}^{(j)}$ will be constructed inductively (in j). The following separation property is essential.

$$\text{If } \theta+<\omega,m>\in I_{\omega}^{(j)} \text{ and } \theta+<\omega,n>\in I_{\omega}^{(j)}, \text{ then either } m=n \text{ or } |m-n|>2N_{j+1}. \tag{3.22}$$

Next we present an outline of the construction of the sets $I_{\omega}^{(j)}$. Let us assume that the smallest length scale $N_1=1$. Then $\Gamma_1=\{0\}$ and the question of invertibility of the 1×1 matrix $T(\theta,\omega)|_{\Gamma_1}$ reduces to the question whether $\theta+r(0)$ can be inverted. Recall that we have assumed that r

is small. We denote $\epsilon := \|r\| \geq |r(0)|$ for some suitable norm $\|\cdot\|$. For $|\theta| \geq 2\epsilon$, say, we have $|T(\theta,\omega)|_{\Gamma_0}^{-1}| \leq 1/\epsilon =: M_0$. We can therefore satisfy (3.20) by setting

$$I_\omega^{(1)} := (-2\epsilon, 2\epsilon)$$

Observe that the separation property (3.22) for $I_\omega^{(1)}$ is equivalent to showing that for $k \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ satisfying $0 < |k| \leq 2N_2$ the following diophantine condition holds

$$| < \omega, k > | > 4\epsilon. \tag{3.23}$$

Such a condition is satisfied for most values of ω, if ϵ is sufficiently small (depending on N_2).

Suppose now that the sets $I_\omega^{(l)}$ have been defined for $1 \leq l \leq j$ satisfying (3.20) – (3.22). In order to construct $I_\omega^{(j+1)}$ we need to determine those values $\theta \in I_\omega^{(j)}$ for which we can establish $\|T(\theta,\omega)|_{\Gamma_{j+1}}^{-1}\| \leq M_{j+1}$. Fix $\theta \in I_\omega^{(j)}$. Since $\theta = \theta + < \omega, 0 > \in I_\omega^{(j)}$ we conclude from the separation property (3.22) that $\theta + < \omega, n > \in \mathbb{R} \setminus I_\omega^{(j)}$ for all lattice sites n satisfying $0 < |n| \leq 2N_{j+1}$. This implies in particular, that for each $n \in \Lambda := \Gamma_{j+1} \setminus \{0\}$ there exists some scale $1 \leq l \leq j$ such that $\|T(\theta,\omega)|_{B_l(n)}^{-1}\| \leq M_l$. As we have described above, the coupling lemma (see lemma 20.1, cf. remark 3.35) then shows that $T(\omega)|_\Lambda$ is invertible and $\|T(\omega)|_\Lambda^{-1}\| \lesssim M_j$. Consider the block decomposition

$$T|_{\Gamma_{j+1}} = \begin{pmatrix} T|_\Lambda & P_1 \\ P_2 & \theta + r(0) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.24}$$

Define

$$b(\theta,\omega) := \theta + r(0) - P_2 (T|_\Lambda)^{-1}(\theta,\omega) P_1. \tag{3.25}$$

Suppose that $b(\theta,\omega) \neq 0$. Then we can invert $T|_{\Gamma_{j+1}}$,

$$T|_{\Gamma_{j+1}}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} T|_\Lambda^{-1} + (T|_\Lambda^{-1}) P_1 b^{-1} P_2 (T|_\Lambda^{-1}) & -(T|_\Lambda^{-1}) P_1 b^{-1} \\ -b^{-1} P_2 (T|_\Lambda^{-1}) & b^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus we define

$$I_\omega^{(j+1)} := \{\theta \in I_\omega^{(j)} : |b(\theta,\omega)| < \delta_{j+1}\}, \quad \text{with } \delta_{j+1} \sim M_{j+1}^{-1}. \tag{3.26}$$

Since the off-diagonal parts P_1, P_2 are assumed to be small with entries decaying rapidly with the distance from the diagonal we expect that $b(\theta,\omega) \sim \theta$. This would imply that the set $I_\omega^{(j+1)}$ has length of order $\delta_{j+1} \sim \Phi(N_{j+1})^{-1}$ which tends to zero as $j \to \infty$. We still need to investigate the separation condition (3.22) for the set $I_\omega^{(j+1)}$. Assuming again that $b(\theta, \omega) \sim \theta$ condition (3.22) essentially leads to a diophantine condition

$$|<\omega, k>| \gtrsim \delta_{j+1} \tag{3.27}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ with $0 < |k| \leq 2N_{j+2}$. This condition can be satisfied for most values of ω if δ_{j+1} is sufficiently small (depending on N_{j+2}).

Suppose one can choose the parameters N_j, Φ, δ_j of the construction such that the above described procedure works. Then for most parameter values ω (which satisfy some diophantine type conditions to ensure that separation properties (3.22) are satisfied) we have obtained a nested sequence of open sets $I_\omega^{(j)}$ (of length $\to 0$ as $j \to \infty$) such that for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ with $<\omega, n> \in \mathbb{R} \backslash I_\omega^{(j)}$ the site n is ω-moderate at some scale $1 \leq l \leq j$. In view of the coupling lemma we can therefore prove bounds $\|T(\omega)|_\Lambda^{-1}\| \lesssim M_j$ for subsets $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, if we can show that $<\omega, n> \in \mathbb{R} \setminus I_\omega^{(j)}$ for all $n \in \Lambda$. Since the inductive construction of the sets $I_\omega^{(j)}$ was rather explicit (involving the function b) the multi-scale analysis as described above yields a powerful tool to investigate for a given sub-lattice $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ the set of parameters ω for which the inverse of $T(\omega)|_\Lambda$ is bounded by $\Phi(\#\Lambda)$. Recall that this is the kind of control required for the modified Newton scheme (3.14) to solve the P – equation (3.8).

We briefly turn to the solution of the bifurcation equation (Q – equation). This equation is degenerate. However, we transform the equation in such a way that it can be solved by a standard implicit function theorem, determining the frequency vector ω as a function of the parameter a. What is more delicate to prove is the fact that the set $\{(a, \omega(a)) : a \text{ small }\}$ is contained in $\mathcal{N}^\infty$ for most values of a. To do this we must find a good description of the set of resonant parameters $\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^{(1)} \setminus \mathcal{N}^\infty$, for which either the separation property (cf. (3.22)) is violated or the inverse of $T_j(\lambda)$ cannot be bounded by $\Phi(\#\Lambda_j)$. Following Bourgain [4] we construct sets of polynomials with coefficients depending on λ which can be used to characterize the set of resonant parameters (see the second part of remark 3.30 for a motivation of these polynomials). To obtain an lower estimate on the set of parameters a for which $(a, \omega(a)) \in \mathcal{N}^\infty$ we employ assumption $A4$ which ensures that to second order ω depends in a non-degenerate way on a.

Remark 3.28 *Symmetries of the equation.* For given F, b, γ we say that the pair (χ, ω) defines a travelling wave solution ($\chi : \mathbb{T}^\nu \to \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$) if

$$\gamma^2 < g, (D^2\chi)(\xi) g >= F(-b + \chi(\xi - \omega) - \chi(\xi)) - F(-b + \chi(\xi) - \chi(\xi + \omega)) \text{ for all } \xi \in \mathbb{T}^\nu. \tag{3.29}$$

Observe that (3.29) implies that the system (x_n) defined through (2.2) solves (2.1). Furthermore, it will become clear in section 5 that equation (3.1) is equivalent to (3.29).

Suppose now that (χ, ω) defines a travelling wave solution. Then

(S1) *Additive constants*

(χ_x, ω) defines a travelling wave solution for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ where $\chi_x(\xi) = \chi(\xi) + x$.

(S2) *Phase shifts*

(χ_ζ, ω) defines a travelling wave solution for $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}^\nu$ where $\chi_\zeta(\xi) = \chi(\xi + \zeta)$.

(S3) *Odd reflection*

$(\tilde{\chi}, \omega)$ defines a travelling wave solution where $\tilde{\chi}(\xi) = -\chi(-\xi)$.

These symmetries allow us to restrict our attention to the reduced space presented in (3.3). The restriction $u(0) = 0$ is stated in proposition 5.22 and is related to (S1). Due to symmetry (S3) we may search for solutions $(\chi,\ \omega)$ with $\chi(\xi) = -\chi(-\xi)$. For the corresponding sequence u this implies that $u(m) \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$. Since we are only interested in real-valued functions χ (i.e. $u(m) = \overline{u(-m)}$) we obtain $u(m) = u(-m) \in \mathbb{R}$.

Suppose that we have constructed a solution $(\chi,\ \omega)$ where χ is an odd function. Denote $a_j = u(e_j) \in \mathbb{R}$. For $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}^\nu$ define χ_ζ as in (S2) and denote by u_ζ the corresponding sequence. Then u_ζ again solves (3.1) by (S2) and $u_\zeta(e_j) = a_j e^{i\zeta_j}$. We therefore obtain solutions with respect to complex parameters $z_j = u(e_j)$ (as claimed in theorem 2.19) through a phase shift from the corresponding odd solutions.

Warning: In our analysis we will also consider complex parameters $\lambda = (a, \omega)$ because this simplifies some of the estimates, e.g. by using the Cauchy integral formula. However, for values of a (and ω) with non-vanishing imaginary parts these solutions do *not* correspond to physical solutions. In particular they do not correspond to some solution u_ζ defined above.

Remark 3.30 The matrices $T_j(\lambda)$ which appear in the modified Newton scheme (3.14) are of the form

$$T_j(\lambda)(m, n) = V(\omega)(m)\delta_{m,n} + r_j(\lambda)(m - n)$$

where $V(\omega)$ was defined in (2.16). Regarding the multi-scale analysis described above for operators (3.15) a number of modifications are needed. In this remark we describe three of the more significant modifications.

Firstly, the diagonal entries have a more complicated behavior with respect to translations (cf. (3.16)). In fact, we may only consider translations with respect to vectors k which satisfy $< k, g >= 0$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} V(\theta,\omega)(m) &:= \begin{cases} F'(-b) & \text{if } < g,m >= 0, \\ F'(-b) - \frac{<g,m>^2\gamma^2}{4\sin^2 \frac{\theta+<\omega,m>}{2}} & \text{else }, \end{cases} \\ T_j(\theta,\lambda)(m,n) &:= V(\theta,\omega)(m)\delta_{m,n} + r_j(\lambda)(m-n). \end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} T_j(0,\lambda) &= T_j(\lambda), \\ T_j(\theta,\lambda)(m+k,n+k) &= T_j(\theta+ <\omega,k>,\lambda)(m,n) \quad \text{if } < k,g >= 0, \end{aligned}$$

replacing relations (3.17), (3.18) of the simplified model. In principle, the restriction $< k, g >= 0$ on the directions k of translation could create great difficulties. However, in our case all singular sites are located within the strip $\{m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu : | < m, g > | \leq \nu\}$ and the restricted directions are sufficient to translate between different singular sites.

Secondly, singular sites appear in clusters of up to 2ν lattice points. Such clusters always appear in the construction of quasi-periodic solutions and we may essentially think of them as translates of the set $\mathcal{S}$ defined in (3.4). This effects the inductive construction of the sets $I_\omega^{(j+1)}$ in the following way. The decomposition of the set $\Gamma_{j+1} = \Lambda \cup \{0\}$ in (3.24) has to be replaced by $\Gamma_{j+1} = \Lambda \cup S$, where S is some subset of $\mathcal{S}$. Bourgain [4] introduced a powerful and general technique to deal with such a situation: Instead of the scalar function b (see (3.25)) he defines a matrix-valued function

$$b(\theta,\lambda) = (T_j|_S)(\theta,\lambda) - P_2(T_j|_\Lambda)^{-1}(\theta,\lambda)P_1,$$

and the definition of the set $I_\omega^{(j+1)}$ (now $I_\lambda^{(j+1)}$, since T_j depends on λ) is replaced by

$$I_\lambda^{(j+1)} := \{\theta \in I_\lambda^{(j)} : |\det b(\theta,\lambda)| < \delta_{j+1}\}.$$

The function $\det b(\theta,\lambda)$ is more complicated to analyze than the function $b(\theta,\omega)$ defined for our simplified version in (3.25). Recall that in the discussion following (3.26) we have argued that $b(\theta,\omega) \sim \theta$ in order to obtain information on the sets $I_\omega^{(j)}$ and to prove the separation property (3.22). Bourgain proposes to apply the Weierstrass preparation theorem to locally replace the function $\det b(\theta,\lambda)$ by polynomials. In our situation we will construct a finite set of pairs (p,ϑ)

where each $p(z,\lambda)$ is a polynomial in z of degree $\leq 2\nu$ with leading coefficient 1 (the other coefficients are small and depend on λ), such that for θ close to ϑ we can estimate

$$|\det b(\theta,\lambda)| \geq c|p(\theta-\vartheta,\lambda)|$$

for some positive constant c. This implies, for example, that a lattice site n is λ-moderate, at some scale $\leq j+1$, if

$$|p(<\omega,n> -\vartheta,\lambda)| > \frac{\delta_{j+1}}{c}$$

for some suitable pair (p,ϑ). Using estimates on the coefficients of the polynomials one can analyze the set of parameters λ for which such a condition holds.

The power of Bourgain's idea is best demonstrated by investigating the separation property (3.22). In fact, suppose that there exist lattice sites $m \neq n$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, such that $\theta + <\omega,n> \in I_\lambda^{(j+1)}$ and $\theta + <\omega,m> \in I_\lambda^{(j+1)}$. By definition there exist pairs (p_1,ϑ_1), (p_2,ϑ_2) such that

$$\begin{aligned} |p_1(\theta + <\omega,m> -\vartheta_1,\lambda)| &\leq \frac{\delta_{j+1}}{c}, \\ |p_2(\theta + <\omega,n> -\vartheta_2,\lambda)| &\leq \frac{\delta_{j+1}}{c} \end{aligned}$$

A resultant type construction (see e.g. section 23) then implies that there exists a polynomial $p \equiv p_1 \ominus p_2$ of degree $\leq 4\nu^2$ such that

$$|p(<\omega,m-n> -(\vartheta_1-\vartheta_2),\lambda)| = \mathcal{O}(\delta_{j+1}).$$

Observe that the dependence on θ has dropped out. We can replace the diophantine condition (3.27) which ensured the separation property in the simplified model above by a condition

$$|p(<\omega,m-n> -(\vartheta_1-\vartheta_2),\lambda)| > C\delta_{j+1}$$

for some positive constant C. With the help of suitable estimates on the coefficients of p one may show that such a condition is satisfied for most values of the parameter λ.

We turn to the third modification. Observe that the matrices $T_j(\theta,\lambda)$ depend on the scale j. One might expect that one has to perform a multi-scale analysis for each operator T_j separately, leading to sequences $I_\lambda^{(l,j)}$ for $l \leq j$. However, we will be able to show that

$$|T_j(\theta,\lambda) - T_l(\theta,\lambda)| << M_l^{-1} \quad \text{for } j \geq l. \tag{3.32}$$

Suppose we have constructed sets $I_\lambda^{(l)}$ such that

$$\|T_1(\theta,\lambda)|_{\Gamma_1}^{-1}\| \le M_1 \qquad \text{if } \theta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus I_\lambda^{(1)}, \tag{3.33}$$

$$\|T_l(\theta,\lambda)|_{\Gamma_l}^{-1}\| \le M_l \qquad \text{if } \theta \in I_\lambda^{(l-1)} \setminus I_\lambda^{(l)}, \;\; l \ge 2 \tag{3.34}$$

(cf. (3.20), (3.21)). Then it follows from (3.32) by a standard application of the Neumann series that

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_j(\theta,\lambda)|_{\Gamma_1}^{-1}\| &\le 2M_1 \qquad \text{for } \theta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus I_\lambda^{(1)}, \qquad j \ge 1 \\ \|T_j(\theta,\lambda)|_{\Gamma_l}^{-1}\| &\le 2M_l \quad \text{for } \theta \in I_\lambda^{(l-1)} \setminus I_\lambda^{(l)}, \;\; j \ge l \ge 2. \end{aligned}$$

This is the reason why it suffices to construct one sequence of nested sets $I_\lambda^{(l)}$ which covers all matrices $T_j(\theta,\lambda)$ simultaneously.

Remark 3.35 In our discussion of the multi-scale analysis above we have used the coupling lemma in order to construct inductively the sets $I_\omega^{(j)}$. The coupling lemma 20.1 allows to paste together local inverse matrices $T|_{B_{N_l}(n)}^{-1}$, $n \in \Lambda$ to an inverse matrix of $T|_\Lambda$. However, one requirement of this procedure is that the local neighborhoods $B_{N_l}(n)$ are contained in the set Λ. Clearly, this condition is violated for lattice sites n which lie close to the boundary of the set Λ. We address this problem in the following way. At scale j we not only consider the invertibility of $T_j|_{\Gamma_j}(\theta,\lambda)$ (recall $\Gamma_j = B_{N_j}(0)$) but also the invertibility of $T_j|_C(\theta,\lambda)$ for $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(j)}$ where $\mathcal{C}^{(j)}$ denotes a certain class of subsets of Γ_j. Correspondingly, we need to construct sets $I_{C,\lambda}^{(j)}$ for all sets $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(j)}$.

Remark 3.36 Observe that the function $V(\theta,\omega)(m)$ defined in (3.31) is 2π – periodic in the variable θ. Hence we can restrict ourselves to define the sets $I_{C,\lambda}^{(j)}$ as subsets of $(-\pi,\pi]$. The periodic extension of this set to the real line will be denoted by

$$\tilde{I}_{C,\lambda}^{(j)} := I_{C,\lambda}^{(j)} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}. \tag{3.37}$$

In this context the following map will be useful.

$$[\cdot] \;\; : \;\; \mathbb{C} \to \{w \in \mathbb{C} : -\pi < \;\text{Re}(w) \le \pi\}, \tag{3.38}$$

where $[z]$ is uniquely defined by the condition $z - [z] \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$.

Remark 3.39 In this remark we discuss the effects of the singularity in the definitions of $T_j(\lambda)$ and $T_j(\theta,\lambda)$. For any subset C of $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$ we define the sets

$$\begin{aligned} Z_C &:= \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{2\nu} :< \omega, m >\in 2\pi\mathbb{Z} \text{ for some } m \in C \text{ with } < m, g >\neq 0\}, && (3.40)\\ \tilde{Z}_C &:= \{(\theta,\lambda) \in \mathbb{C}^{2\nu+1} : \theta + < \omega, m >\in 2\pi\mathbb{Z} \text{ for some } m \in C \text{ with } < m, g >\neq 0\}. && (3.41) \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the restricted matrices $T_j|_C(\lambda)$ are well defined if $\lambda \notin Z_C$ and the matrices $T_j|_C(\theta,\lambda)$ are well defined if $(\theta,\lambda) \notin \tilde{Z}_C$. These sets of singularities, however, create no difficulties in our analysis. Recall that the Newton scheme only uses the inverse of the matrices $T_j|_C$. We will show that the inverse matrices $(T_j|_C)^{-1}(\lambda)$, $(T_j|_C)^{-1}(\theta,\lambda)$ can be continued analytically across Z_C, respectively across $\tilde{Z}_C$.

We conclude this section by describing the plan of the paper.

The proof of theorem 2.19 contains many parameters, like the size of the length scales N_j, the bounds M_j on the inverse matrices, the choice of δ_j in the definition of the sets $I^{(j)}_{C,\lambda}$ and many more. In section 4 we show that we can choose all these parameters of the construction in such a way that the above described multi-scale analysis works (see lemma 4.54). In section 4 we also collect and explain all the notation used in chapters II and III. For the convenience of the reader we also include a table of notation at the end of the appendix (section 25).

In section 5 we derive the equations for the frequency vector ω and for the modified Fourier coefficients $u(m)$. Our analysis is greatly facilitated by using appropriate norms for the sequences of Fourier coefficients (cf. [44]). We choose weighted ℓ_1-norms. The weights are either of exponential growth or lie in the Gevrey class. Similar weights have already been used in the context of small divisor problems by DeLatte [22], Craig and Wayne [10] and Bourgain [4]. In the first part of section 5 we introduce the weight functions and norms used in this paper and we prove their basic properties.

In sections $6-12$ we deal with the small divisor problem and solve the $P-$equation (see (3.8) and theorem 12.4). As explained above we proceed inductively. At every step j of the induction we construct the approximate solutions v_j, the set of good (i.e. non-resonant parameters $\mathcal{N}^{(j)}$) and the sets $I^{(j)}_{C,\lambda}$ of the multi-scale analysis. The induction statements $(\mathcal{IS})_j$, which take a slightly different form for $j = 1$ and $j \geq 2$, are stated in sections 6 and 7. Essentially they contain the following claims.

Induction Statement $(\mathcal{IS})_j$

(1) Regularity properties of $v_j(\lambda)$.

Estimates on $v_j(\lambda)$, $\partial^\beta v_j(\lambda)$ and on $\mathcal{P}(v_j(\lambda), \lambda)$.

Symmetries and support of $v_j(\lambda)$.

(2) Description of the set of "good" parameters $\mathcal{N}^{(j)}$ at scale j as a disjoint union of cubes.

Description of the set of parameters $\mathcal{N}^{(j-1)} \setminus \mathcal{N}^{(j)}$ which is removed at the j-th step in terms of a finite set of polynomials (cf. remark 3.30 above). Estimates on the number of polynomials and on the coefficients of the polynomials.

(3) (a) Location of the set $I_{C,\lambda}^{(j)}$ (cf remarks 3.35 and 3.44).

(b) Diophantine estimates for lattice sites m with $2N_{j-1} < |m| \leq 2N_j$ and frequencies ω satisfying $(a, \omega) \in \mathcal{N}^{(j)}$.

(c) For all $\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^{(j)}$ the lattice sites m satisfying $2N_{j-1} < |m| \leq 2N_j$ are λ-moderate at some scale $1 \leq l \leq j$ with respect to $T_j(\lambda)$.

(d) For all $\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^{(j)}$ the separation property (cf. (3.22)) holds for the sets $I_{C,\lambda}^{(j)}$.

(4) The analog of statements (3.33), respectively (3.34) hold for the matrices

$T^{(j)}(\theta, \lambda) = \operatorname{diag}(V(\theta, \omega)) + (DW)(\varphi(a) + v_j(\lambda))$.

Remark 3.42 When we actually perform the induction in chapter II, there are a few differences from the just described induction statements which might be somewhat confusing (e.g. at step j we will consider length scales N_{j-1} rather than length scales N_j). It should be emphasized that the discussion of section 3 is formal and although it is very close to the actual analysis of chapters II and III, the accurate definitions and statements are found in those chapters.

Remark 3.43 The induction statements of sections 6 and 7 are slightly stronger than just described. They are required to hold also for parameters which lie in small complex neighborhoods of the sets $\mathcal{N}^{(j)}$ and $I_{C,\lambda}^{(j)}$.

Remark 3.44 We find it convenient to use cube decompositions to control the geometry of the sets $\mathcal{N}^{(j)}$. The cubes are numbered by some $k \in K^{(j)}$. We choose the sets $I_{C,\lambda}^{(j)}$ in such a way that they agree for all values of λ belonging to the same sub-cube. Hence we can index these sets by $I_{C,k}^{(j)}$ with $k \in K^{(j)}$.

The induction statement simplifies in the case $j = 1$ since we choose $v_1(\lambda) \equiv 0$ and $\mathcal{N}^{(1)}$ to be some cubic neighborhood of $\lambda^{(0)}$. Statements (3) and (4) follow essentially from the diophantine assumption A3. Observe that statement (4) is formulated in terms of a lower bound on the diagonal entries of $T^{(1)}$. The details of the proof of $(\mathcal{IS})_{j=1}$ are presented in section 6.

The proof of the induction step $j \to j+1$ stretches over sections $8 - 11$. First we construct the new iterate v_{j+1}. Recall that we denote the scales corresponding to the multi-scale analysis by N_j. These scales grow super-exponentially in j and hence they increase too fast for a Newton scheme. For this reason we need to perform many Newton iterations to obtain $v_{j+1}(\lambda)$ from $v_j(\lambda)$. For each iteration the bounds on the inverse matrices follow via the coupling lemma from the induction hypothesis (3c) and from estimates $\|T^{(j)} - T^{(l)}\| << \|(T^{(l)})^{-1}\|$, $j \geq l$, which follow from the fast convergence of the sequence v_j (see induction statement (4) above for a definition of $T^{(j)}$).

For the construction of v_{j+1} we distinguish the cases $j = 1$ (section 8) and $j \geq 2$ (section 9). The reason for this distinction is that we have chosen the parameters of the construction in such a way that in the step $1 \to 2$ we do not encounter small divisors. This enables us to use norms with exponentially growing weights (rather than the slower growing Gevrey type weights which we use in the context of the multi-scale analysis) leading to better estimates on v_2 which are much needed in chapter III. In section 10 we construct the polynomials which are used to define the sets $I^{(j+1)}_{C,\lambda}$ and $\mathcal{N}^{(j+1)}$ (cf. the second part of remark 3.30). We complete the proof of the induction step in section 11. In section 12 the solution of the P – equation and certain properties of the solution are stated in theorem 12.4 which follows immediately from the induction statements. This ends chapter II.

In chapter III we solve the bifurcation equation (Q – equation) by determining ω as a function of a (section 13). Section 14 is devoted to deriving the estimates on the derivatives of the function $\omega = \omega(a)$ which are necessary to prove lower bounds on the measure of the set $\{a : (a, \omega(a)) \in \mathcal{N}^{\infty}\}$. In section 15 we are finally ready to prove our main result, theorem 2.19.

We have collected those lemmata in the appendix which can be formulated somewhat independently from the constructions of chapters II and III. Some of these tools might be interesting by themselves.

In section 16 we study the genericity of assumptions A1 – A4 of our main result. We find a fairly explicit description of the exceptional set of force laws F for which we cannot verify assumptions A1 – A4 (see lemma 16.31 and theorem 16.32). Section 17 contains the essential part of the proof of property (5.18) for the weight functions we consider in this paper. Property (5.18) together with the definition of the corresponding norms on sequence and matrix spaces facilitate a number of estimates needed in the multi-scale analysis. In sections 18 and 19 we prove basic facts about the nonlinear, respectively linear part of our lattice equation. In section 20 we formulate and prove a version of the coupling lemma which has been introduced in [44].

We mentioned in remark 3.30 above that we have to estimate the coefficients of polynomials which are obtained by an application of the Weierstrass preparation theorem. Hence one needs to carefully investigate the construction of these polynomials in the proof of the Weierstrass preparation theorem. Such an analysis was provided by Bourgain [6] in the even more complicated situation that the degree of the polynomials may be arbitrarily large. For completeness sake we present Bourgain's nice proof in section 21.

The estimates on the sets $\mathcal{N}^{(j-1)} \setminus \mathcal{N}^{(j)}$ of resonant parameters are all based on an elementary lemma for real valued functions defined on an interval. The lemma concerns functions with the property that there exists a $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the k-th derivative of this function is continuous and uniformly bounded away from 0. For such functions g one can derive good upper bounds on the sets $\{x : |g(x)| \leq \delta\}$. This is made precise and proved in section 22.

In section 23 we perform a resultant type construction. For given polynomials p, $q \in \mathbb{C}[z]$ it provides three polynomials $p \ominus q \in \mathbb{C}[z]$ and R_1, $R_2 \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ such that

$$(p \ominus q)(x - y) = p(x)R_1(x, y) + q(y)R_2(x, y).$$

As mentioned in remark 3.30 above it was the idea of Bourgain to use such an algebraic construction to prove the separation property (3.22). In our analysis we not only use the existence of such a representation but we also need estimates on the coefficients of $p \ominus q$, R_1 and R_2. Therefore we investigate how the coefficients of these polynomials can be obtained from the coefficients of p and q.

Throughout our analysis we need to estimate higher order derivatives of composed functions or of functions which are defined implicitly. In many cases we cannot use the Cauchy integral formula to obtain such bounds. In such situations we employ somewhat explicit formulae for the higher order chain rule which are adapted to the desired estimates. We have collected these different versions of the chain rule in section 24.

Acknowledgments. It is my great pleasure to thank Professor P. Deift and Professor E. Wienholtz for their constant support, advice and encouragement. I thank J. Bourgain, L. Chierchia, W.

Craig, P. Deift, R. de la Llave, K. T-R McLaughlin, J. Pöschel, J. Shatah, T. Spencer and C. E. Wayne for useful conversations on small divisor problems. Part of the work was completed while I was visiting Courant Institute, New York, and the Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik in den Naturwissenschaften, Leipzig. I am grateful to both institutes for their hospitality and for providing a stimulating research environment. The author was supported in part by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft grants # Kr 1673/1-1 and # Kr 1673/2-1.

Chapter II

The Small Divisor Problem

The goal of chapter II is to solve the P – equation (see theorem 12.4). Throughout chapter II and chapter III we assume that the hypothesis of theorem 2.19 holds, i.e. $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $0 < \kappa < 1$ are given and assumptions A1 – A4 are satisfied.

4 Notation and definitions

In this section we explain the notation and definitions used in chapters II and III to prove theorem 2.19. For quick reference we have also included a table of notation in section 25 at the end of this paper. There is a reason why we introduce all the notation before we begin the proof. As we will see there are many parameters in the construction which must satisfy a large number of conditions. If we would introduce these parameters only when they first appear in the proof it would be a difficult task to verify that no circular or contradictory definitions have been made. This issue is resolved in the following way. We present the definitions in such an order that by starting from the quantities given in theorem 2.19 and in assumptions A1 – A4 one may verify one by one that the definitions make sense. However, from part **H)** on the definitions will depend on a parameter $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. We show at the end of the present section (lemma 4.54) that n_0 can be chosen in such a way that all conditions on the parameters which appear in the proof of theorem 2.19 are satisfied. To facilitate the proof of lemma 4.54 we collect at the beginning of each of the sections 6 - 15 the conditions which are used in that particular section.

A) General Notation

For any $d \in \mathbb{R}$ we denote by $|\cdot|$ the maximum norm on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbb{C}^d$. Sometimes we also use ℓ_1 – or ℓ_2 – norms on these spaces which are denoted by $|\cdot|_1$, respectively $|\cdot|_2$. In our notation we distinguish real and complex neighborhoods. For sets $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $Z \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ and positive numbers ρ we define

$$\begin{aligned} B_\rho(X) &:= B(X,\rho) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : |y-x| < \rho \ \text{ for some } \ x \in X\}, & (4.1) \\ U_\rho(Z) &:= U(Z,\rho) := \{w \in \mathbb{C}^d : |w-z| < \rho \ \text{ for some } \ z \in Z\}. & (4.2) \end{aligned}$$

In case the sets $X = \{x\}$, $Z = \{z\}$ contain only a single point we usually replace in (4.1), (4.2) the sets X, Z by the elements x, z. Note that in this case $B_\rho(x)$ defines a cube and $U_\rho(z)$ defines a polydisc since we use the maximum norm for the definition of the neighborhoods. By a slight abuse of notation we sometimes restrict the neighborhoods to the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$, i.e. $B_N(n) = \{m \in \mathbb{Z}^d : |m-n| < N\}$ for lattice sites $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $N > 0$.

For a, $b \in \mathbb{C}^d$ we define

$$< a, b > := \sum_{i=1}^{d} a_i b_i. \tag{4.3}$$

Note that there are no complex conjugates in this definition.

The function $[\cdot]$ was defined in (3.38). We also use the floor function

$$\lfloor \cdot \rfloor \ : \ \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{Z} \ \ ; \quad \lfloor x \rfloor = \max\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : n \leq x\}. \tag{4.4}$$

B) Notation related to the statement of theorem 2.19

We are given the function F and the numbers b, γ, κ through the hypothesis of theorem 2.19. The following quantities are defined due to assumptions A1 – A4: the number of phases ν (2.11), the frequency vector of the linearized system $\omega^{(0)}$ (2.12), (2.13), the vector g (2.10), positive constants s and τ related to assumption A3 (2.14), and the matrix Ω (2.15) – (2.18).

C) Notation related to the weight functions

In section 5 we define families of weight functions on $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$ and corresponding weighted norms for sequence and matrix spaces. We define the following parameters

$$\begin{aligned} c &:= 0.01 & (4.5) \\ D_N &:= \max(D_{\nu,c}, D_{\nu,1}) \geq 1, & (4.6) \end{aligned}$$

where $D_{\nu,c}$ and $D_{\nu,1}$ are defined in (17.1) and shown to be finite in proposition 17.2. Weight functions $w_{\sigma,c}$, $w_{\sigma,1}$ are defined for $\sigma \geq 1/4$ in 5.15. The corresponding sequence spaces $(X_{\sigma,c}, \|\cdot\|_{\sigma,c})$, $(X_{\sigma,1}, \|\cdot\|_{\sigma,1})$ and matrix spaces $(\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,c}, \|\cdot\|_{\sigma,c})$, $(\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,1}, \|\cdot\|_{\sigma,1})$ are defined in 5.21 (see also (5.2), (5.10)).

With each application of the coupling lemma 20.1 we loose some of the decay properties of the matrices. Therefore we use a scale of spaces $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_j,c}$ with

$$\sigma_j := \frac{1}{2}(1+\frac{1}{j}) \quad \text{for } j \geq 1. \tag{4.7}$$

D) Notation related to the nonlinear part of the equation

The function F is assumed to be real analytic in a neighborhood of $-b$. We denote by $\tilde{r}_{F,b}$ the radius of convergence of the corresponding power series at $-b$ and set

$$\begin{aligned} r_{F,b} &:= \min(1, \tilde{r}_{F,b}), & (4.8)\\ F(y) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k (y+b)^k \quad \text{for } |y+b| < r_{F,b} & (4.9) \end{aligned}$$

which defines the sequence $(\alpha_k)_{k\geq 0}$ $(\alpha_k = F^{(k)}(-b)/(k!))$. The nonlinear part of the Fourier equation is given by

$$W(u) = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \alpha_k u^{*k},$$

where u^{*k} denotes the k-th convolution power of the sequence u (see notation 5.9). The definition of $W(u)$ is purely formal at this point. In lemma 18.1 the definition is made rigorous for sequences u in $X_{\sigma,c}$, resp. $X_{\sigma,1}$. Furthermore, the constant D_W is defined through lemma 18.1.

E) Notation related to the Lyapunov – Schmidt decomposition

In order to describe the Lyapunov – Schmidt reduction we defined the diagonal operators $D(\omega)$ (3.2), the set $\mathcal{S}$ (3.4), the projections Q (3.5) and P (3.6), the parameterization $\varphi(a)$ (3.9), the parameter $\lambda^{(0)}$ (3.11) and the functions $\mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{Q}$ (3.13), (3.12) which describe the P – equation, respectively Q – equation of the Lyapunov - Schmidt reduction.

Recall that we first solve the P – equation for v. The parameters of this equation (a, ω) are denoted by λ (see (3.10)).

F) Notation related to the linearized equations

For $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by $v_j(\lambda)$ the j-th approximation of the solution $v(\lambda)$ of the P – equation. As explained in section 3 we need to investigate the invertibility of the following matrices

$$\begin{aligned} T^{(j)}(\lambda)(m,n) &= V(\omega)(m)\delta_{m,n} + DW(\varphi(a)+v_j(\lambda))(m,n), & (4.10)\\ T^{(j)}(\theta,\lambda)(m,n) &= V(\theta,\omega)(m)\delta_{m,n} + DW(\varphi(a)+v_j(\lambda))(m,n), & (4.11) \end{aligned}$$

where $V(\omega)$, $V(\theta,\omega)$ were defined in (2.16), (3.31). For $l \in \mathbb{N}$ set

$$V_l : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\} \; ; \quad V_l(\vartheta) := \alpha_1 - \frac{l^2\gamma^2}{4\sin^2\frac{\vartheta}{2}}. \tag{4.12}$$

Observe that $V(\theta,\omega)(m) = V_{|<m,g>|}(\theta + <\omega, m>)$. In our analysis we use a few estimates on the functions V_l, mainly in a neighborhood of their zeros. It is easy to see from assumption A2 that V_l has zeros only for $1 \le l \le \nu$. In this case the set of zeros of V_l is given by $\{\pm\omega_l^{(0)}\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. The properties of the functions V_l, $1 \le l \le \nu$, which are needed in the proof of theorem 2.19 are collected in proposition 19.1. In this proposition one also finds the definition of the constants d_V, δ_V and D_V.

The quantities $V(\omega)(m)$, $V(\theta,\omega)(m)$ are not well defined if $<\omega, m> \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$, respectively $\theta + <\omega, m> \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. Hence for $C \subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ the restricted matrices $T_C^{(j)}(\lambda)$, $T_C^{(j)}(\theta,\lambda)$ are not well defined for $\lambda \in Z_C$, respectively $(\theta,\lambda) \in \tilde{Z}_C$. The sets Z_C, $\tilde{Z}_C$ were defined in (3.40), (3.41).

G) Special constants and functions

In the course of proving theorem 2.19 a number of constants and functions are used. We list them here. Of particular interest are definitions (4.13) – (4.17) as they are closely related to the choice of parameters in the multi-scale analysis (see (4.44) – (4.48)).

$$A := 25600\nu^8\,(2\lfloor\tau\rfloor + 5) \tag{4.13}$$

$$A_1 := 4\nu \tag{4.14}$$

$$E_\rho := 32\nu^3(\lfloor\tau\rfloor + 3) \tag{4.15}$$

$$E_\delta := 32\nu^3(\lfloor\tau\rfloor + 1) \tag{4.16}$$

$$E_M := 32\nu^3(2\lfloor\tau\rfloor + 5) \tag{4.17}$$

$$q := 1 + A(E_M + E_\rho) \tag{4.18}$$

$$B_0 := 22\nu^3 \tag{4.19}$$

$$B_1 := 8\nu^2 \tag{4.20}$$

$$B_2 := 18\nu^3 \tag{4.21}$$

$$D_\tau := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 5^{k(\tau+1)} e^{-1.5^k} \tag{4.22}$$

$$D_E(x) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 5^{kE_\rho(x-1)} e^{-1.5^k} \quad \text{for } x \ge 1 \tag{4.23}$$

$$d_{\tau,c} := \min_{x\geq 1} \frac{e^{\frac{1}{2}x^c}}{2x^\tau} \tag{4.24}$$

$$d_{min} := \min_{\xi\in\mathbb{R}^\nu, |\xi|_2=1} |\Omega\xi| \tag{4.25}$$

$$\tilde{d}_{min} := \min_{1\leq j,l\leq \nu} |\Omega_{j,l}| \tag{4.26}$$

$$D_{1,1} := 4D_N \left(\sum_{p=1}^{B_0+1} p^{B_0}\right) \left(\frac{16\alpha_1}{d_V\gamma^2}\right)^{B_0+1} 2^{E_\rho B_0} \tag{4.27}$$

$$D_{1,2} := 2\cdot 8^{B_0}(B_0!) \left(\sum_{p=1}^{B_0+1} p^{B_0} D_N^p\right) \tag{4.28}$$

$$D_{1,3} := (8D_N \max(D_{1,1}, D_{1,2}))^{B_0+1} \left(\sum_{p=1}^{B_0+1} p^{B_0}\right) \left(\max_{y\geq 0}(1+y)^{q(2B_0+1)} e^{-\frac{1}{4}y^c}\right) \tag{4.29}$$

$$D_{1,4} := 2^{B_0}D_V + 4^{B_0}D_V D_{1,3} \left(\max_{y\geq 0}(1+y)^{q(2B_0+1)} e^{-\frac{1}{4}|y-1|^c}\right) \tag{4.30}$$

$$D_{1,5} := (2\nu)!2^{2\nu}(2\nu)^{B_0} \tag{4.31}$$

$$D_1 := (2\nu)!(2D_{1,4})^{2\nu}(2\nu)^{B_0} \tag{4.32}$$

$$D_2 := (2\nu+B_1)^{B_1^2}(75D_1(B_1!)2^{B_1})^{2B_1-1} \tag{4.33}$$

$$D_3 := (B_1+1)!37e^6\nu^2 D_W D_N^2 D_\tau D_E(B_1+1) \tag{4.34}$$

$$D_{4,2} := D_W D_3^{B_1+1} \left(\sum_{p=1}^{B_1+1} \frac{1}{p!} p^{B_1+1}\right) \tag{4.35}$$

$$D_{4,1} := D_V + D_{4,2} \tag{4.36}$$

$$D_4 := D_{4,1}(\nu+B_1)^{B_1} \frac{2}{d_V} \tag{4.37}$$

$$D_P := (4\nu^2)!2^{4\nu}(4\nu)^{B_1} D_2^{4\nu} \tag{4.38}$$

$$D_K := \nu^2 D_P + 10\nu^2 4^{(2\nu+1)^2}[(2\nu+1)^2!] \tag{4.39}$$

Definition of the mollifier ψ. We choose a function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^{4\nu} \to \mathbb{R}$ with the following four properties.

(1) $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{4\nu})$

(2) $\text{supp}(\psi) \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{4\nu} : |x| < 1\}$.

(3) $\psi(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{4\nu}$.

(4) $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{4\nu}} \psi(x)dx = 1$.

For $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ define

$$D_\psi(k) := \sup_{|\beta|_1 \leq k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4\nu}} |\partial^\beta \psi(x)| dx. \tag{4.40}$$

Definition of $\tilde{\kappa}$. The set $\mathcal{Z}$ in the statement of theorem 2.19 turns out to be of the form

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{(z_1, \ldots, z_\nu) \in \mathbb{C}^\nu : (|z_1|, \ldots, |z_\nu|) \in \mathcal{M}^\infty\}$$

for some suitable set $\mathcal{M}^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}^\nu$. We need to understand how lower bounds on the ν-dimensional Lebesgue measure of the set $\mathcal{M}^\infty$ translate to lower bounds on the 2ν-dimensional Lebesgue measure of the set $\mathcal{Z}$ regarded as a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{2\nu}$. For a set $M \subset \mathbb{R}^\nu$ denote

$$M^{\mathbb{C}} := \{(z_1, \ldots, z_\nu) \in \mathbb{C}^\nu : (|z_1|, \ldots, |z_\nu|) \in M\} \subset \mathbb{C}^\nu \equiv \mathbb{R}^{2\nu}.$$

Recall that $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ was given in theorem 2.19. We define

$$\tilde{\kappa} := \inf\{ \operatorname{vol}^\nu(B_1(0) \setminus M) : M \subset B_1(0) \text{ and } \operatorname{vol}^{2\nu}(M^{\mathbb{C}}) \leq \kappa \operatorname{vol}^{2\nu}(U_1(0))\}. \tag{4.41}$$

It is elementary to show the following proposition.

Proposition 4.42 *Given $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \kappa < 1$ and let $\tilde{\kappa}$ be defined as in (4.41). Then*

(a) $\tilde{\kappa} > 0$.

(b) For any $\rho > 0$ and any measurable set $M \subset B_\rho(0)$ with $vol^\nu(B_\rho(0) \setminus M) \leq \tilde{\kappa}\rho^\nu$ it follows that $vol^{2\nu}(M^{\mathbb{C}}) \geq \kappa \ vol^{2\nu}(U_\rho(0))$.

H) Parameters of the multi-scale analysis depending on n_0

$$N_0 := 5^{n_0} \tag{4.43}$$

$$N_j := N_0^{A^j} \tag{4.44}$$

$$\rho_j := N_j^{-E_\rho} \tag{4.45}$$

$$\tilde{\rho}_j := N_j^{-A_1 E_\rho} \tag{4.46}$$

$$\delta_j := N_j^{-E_\delta} \tag{4.47}$$

$$M_j := N_j^{E_M} \tag{4.48}$$

I) The sets $\mathcal{C}^{(j)}$ and $\mathcal{POL}$

We define the following classes of subsets in $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$ (cf. remark 3.35).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^{(1)} &:= \{C \subset B_{1.5}(0) : C \cap \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset\}, & (4.49)\\ \mathcal{C}^{(j)} &:= \{C \subset B_{N_{j-1}}(0) : C \cap \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset \text{ and } C \text{ interval } \},\ \ j \geq 2, & (4.50) \end{aligned}$$

where we say that a set $C \subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ is an interval, if there exist real numbers a_i, b_i, $1 \leq i \leq \nu$ such that $C = \{n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu : a_i < n_i < b_i \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq \nu\}$.

Recall the definition of the constant D_P in (4.38). We call a map $p : \mathbb{C} \times U \to \mathbb{C}$ an *admissible polynomial*, if $\emptyset \neq U \subset \mathbb{C}^{2\nu}$ and there exist $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and analytic functions $c_i : U \to \mathbb{C}$, $0 \leq i < d$, such that

$$p(\theta, \lambda) = \theta^d + \sum_{0 \leq i < d} c_i(\lambda)\theta^i$$

and the following three conditions are satisfied:

(1) $1 \leq d \leq 4\nu^2$,

(2) $c_i(\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $\lambda \in U \cap \mathbb{R}^{2\nu}$, $0 \leq i < d$,

(3) $|\partial^\beta c_i(\lambda)| \leq D_P M_0^{4(B_0+\nu)|\beta|_1}$ for all $\lambda \in U$, $0 \leq i < d$, $0 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq B_1$.

We define

$$\mathcal{POL} := \{(p, \vartheta) : p \text{ is an admissible polynomial and } \vartheta \in \mathbb{R}\}. \tag{4.51}$$

J) Cube decompositions and the projections $\pi_l^{(j)}$

Let ρ, $\tilde{\rho} > 0$ with $\rho/\tilde{\rho} \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $x \in \mathbb{R}^{2\nu}$. Then there exists a set $\{y_k \in \mathbb{R}^{2\nu} : 1 \leq k \leq (\rho/\tilde{\rho})^{2\nu}\}$ which is uniquely defined by the following two conditions.

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{B_\rho(x)} &= \bigcup_k \overline{B_{\tilde{\rho}}(y_k)}\\ B_{\tilde{\rho}}(y_k) \cap B_{\tilde{\rho}}(y_l) &= \emptyset \ \text{ for } l \neq k. \end{aligned}$$

We use such cube decompositions for the sets of parameters $\mathcal{N}^{(j)}$ which appear in the induction statements in sections 6 and 7.

$$\overline{\mathcal{N}^{(j)}} = \bigcup_{k \in K^{(j)}} \overline{B_{\rho_j}(\lambda_k^{(j)})} = \bigcup_{k \in K^{(j+0.5)}} \overline{B_{\tilde{\rho}_j}(\lambda_k^{(j+0.5)})} \tag{4.52}$$

The sets $K^{(l)}$, $\{\lambda_k^{(l)} : k \in K^{(l)}\}$, $K^{(l+0.5)}$, $\{\lambda_k^{(l+0.5)} : k \in K^{(l+0.5)}\}$ are defined inductively in l. We will define $K^{(1)} = \{1\}$ and $\lambda_1^{(1)} = \lambda^{(0)}$ (see (6.6) – (6.8) below). Each induction step $j \to j+1$ consists of two parts. First we perform a cube decomposition of each cube $B_{\rho_j}(\lambda_k^{(j)})$, $k \in K^{(j)}$ into sub-cubes of radius $\tilde{\rho}_j$, yielding sets $K^{(j+0.5)}$, $\{\lambda_k^{(j+0.5)} : k \in K^{(j+0.5)}\}$ (see also (4.52)). Observe that $\rho_j/\tilde{\rho}_j \in \mathbb{N}$, since A, A_1, E_ρ, N_j are integers (see (4.13) – (4.15), (4.43) – (4.46), $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ by lemma 4.54) and the cube decomposition is well defined. Then one performs a cube decomposition on each cube $B_{\tilde{\rho}_j}(\lambda_k^{(j+0.5)})$, $k \in K^{(j+0.5)}$ into sub-cubes of radius ρ_{j+1} ($\tilde{\rho}_j/\rho_{j+1} \in \mathbb{N}$ since $A/A_1 \in \mathbb{N}$) obtaining sets $\hat{K}^{(j+1)}$, $\{\lambda_k^{(j+1)} : k \in \hat{K}^{(j+1)}\}$. The set $K^{(j+1)}$ is defined as a subset of $\hat{K}^{(j+1)}$ by removing those cubes which contain resonant parameters. We define the following projection map between sets $K^{(l)}$. Let $l, j \in \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{N}+1)$ with $l \leq j$.

$$\pi_l^{(j)} : K^{(j)} \to K^{(l)}, \;\; \pi_l^{(j)}(k) \text{ is defined by the condition } \; \lambda_k^{(j)} \in B_{\rho_l}\left(\lambda^{(l)}_{\pi_l^{(j)}(k)}\right). \tag{4.53}$$

In the case that l is not an integer we understand $\rho_l \equiv \tilde{\rho}_{l-0.5}$.

We conclude this section by determining the parameter n_0.

Lemma 4.54 *Suppose that* $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$ *and* $0 < \kappa < 1$ *are given and satisfy assumptions A1 – A4. There exists an integer* $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that conditions (6.1) – (6.4), (8.1) – (8.13), (12.1), (13.1) – (13.3), (15.1) – (15.3) are satisfied; conditions (10.2) – (10.56), (11.1) – (11.7), (14.1) – (14.15) are satisfied for* $j \geq 1$ *and conditions (9.1) – (9.17) are satisfied for* $j \geq 2$.

For the remaining part of chapter II and for chapter III we will let n_0 be a fixed integer satisfying the conditions stated in lemma 4.54. This completes the definitions given in parts H) and I) of this section.

Proof. One proves lemma 4.54 by showing that each condition is satisfied for sufficiently large values of n_0. Of course, in case the condition depends on the induction step $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we must ensure that the lower bound on n_0 is uniform in j. For the proof it is important to observe that the only quantities appearing in the conditions which depend on n_0 are N_j, ρ_j, $\tilde{\rho}_j$, δ_j and M_j ($j \geq 0$). We choose a few examples to demonstrate the method of proof.

- (8.7): It follows from assumption A2 and from the definition of ν in (2.11) that

$$\frac{(\nu+1)^2\gamma^2}{4} - \alpha_1 > 0. \tag{4.55}$$

The only quantity in (8.7) which depends on n_0 is N_0. Since $E_\rho > 1$ (4.15) and $\tau > 0$ (assumption A3) (4.55) implies that (8.7) holds for sufficiently large n_0.

- (8.8): The only quantities, depending on n_0 are N_0 and $\rho_0 = N_0^{-E_\rho}$. Since $E_\rho > \tau + 1$ (see (4.15)) it is clear that $N_0^{\tau+1}\rho_0 \to 0$ as $n_0 \to \infty$, proving (8.8)
- (9.10): Using (4.44), (4.48) it suffices to show that for all $j \geq 1$

$$\log(4D_N) + AE_M \log(N_j) \leq \frac{1}{4(j+1)(j+2)} N_j^c. \tag{4.56}$$

We obtain the condition on n_0 by investigating (4.56) inductively. For $j = 1$ we need

$$\log(4D_N) + n_0 A^2 E_M \log 5 \leq \frac{1}{24} 5^{Acn_0}$$

which is clearly satisfied for sufficiently large n_0. For the induction step $j \to j+1$, $j \geq 1$, we estimate the ratios

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \frac{\log(4D_N) + AE_M \log(N_{j+1})}{\log(4D_N) + AE_M \log(N_j)} &\leq A, \\ \frac{4(j+1)(j+2)N_{j+1}^c}{4(j+2)(j+3)N_j^c} &\geq \frac{1}{2} N_j^{(A-1)c} \geq \frac{1}{2} 5^{A(A-1)cn_0}. \end{aligned}$$

For n_0 sufficiently large we have

$$A \leq \frac{1}{2} 5^{A(A-1)cn_0}$$

completing the proof of (4.56)

- (10.35): We may replace (10.35) by the following three conditions

$$(8/\rho_{j+1})^{B_0} \leq e^{\frac{1}{32}N_j^c} \quad \text{for all } j \geq 1, \tag{4.57}$$

$$B_0! D_W e^{-\frac{1}{32}N_1^c} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \tag{4.58}$$

$$e^{-\frac{1}{32}N_{j+1}^c} \leq \frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{1}{32}N_j^c} \quad \text{for all } j \geq 1. \tag{4.59}$$

Observe that there exists a number $\tilde{N} > 0$ such that for all $N \geq \tilde{N}$

$$(8N^{AE_\rho})^{B_0} \leq e^{\frac{1}{32}N^c}.$$

If n_0 is chosen large enough such that $5^{An_0} \geq \tilde{N}$ then (4.57) is satisfied. Condition (4.58) can clearly be satisfied by choosing n_0 large and condition (4.59) is satisfied if $N_1^c(N_1^{c(A-1)} - 1) \geq 32 \log 2$ which again is achieved by making n_0 large.

- (10.48): Recall that $k! \geq (k/e)^k$. Since $\nu \geq 2$ we have $B_2/4 \geq 12\nu$ and $B_2 \geq 2\nu(B_1 + 1)$ (see (4.20), (4.21)). Hence $B_2! \geq (12\nu)^{B_2} \geq (12\nu)^{2\nu(B_1+1)}$.

- (14.15): Since $N_j = 5^{n_0 A^j}$ and $A \geq 2$ it is clear that $N_j \geq 2^j$ independent of the choice of $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. We can therefore replace (14.15) by

$$N_j^{-AE_\delta/B_1 + A_1 E_\rho + (\nu+2)A + (4\nu+1) + 2E_\delta} \leq \tilde{\kappa} \quad \text{for all } j \geq 1. \tag{4.60}$$

One verifies from the definitions of A, A_1, E_δ, E_ρ and B_1 that the exponent in (4.60) is negative. Since $N_j \geq N_1$ for all $j \geq 1$ one can satisfy (14.15) simultaneously for all values of j by choosing n_0 large enough. □

Remark 4.61 The conditions which appear in lemma 4.54 not only determine n_0 but they are also the reason behind the choices which were made for c, B_0, B_1, B_2, A, A_1, E_ρ, E_δ, E_M. To determine these constants on can proceed for example in the following way. First define c satisfying (9.14), then choose B_0, B_1 and B_2 via (14.7), (10.46) and (10.44). We are then left with conditions on A, A_1, E_ρ, E_δ and E_M. The conditions for these quantities are somewhat involved as one can already see from the condition that the exponent in (4.60) is negative appearing in the proof of (14.15) above. The following list shows all conditions which contain at least two quantities of A, A_1, E_ρ, E_δ, E_M.

- $E_\delta + 1 < E_\rho$: (6.2), (9.9), (10.8), (10.10), (10.13), (10.17), (10.34), (10.42), (11.2), (11.3)
- $E_M > E_\delta + E_\rho$: (10.33), (10.37), (9.11), (10.15)
- $AE_\delta > E_\rho - 1$: (10.6)
- $AE_\rho > E_M(2B_0 + 1)$: (10.39)
- $AE_\delta > E_M$: (10.43)
- $2E_M(B_0 + \nu) + 2\nu AE_\delta < E_\rho AA_1$: (10.47)
- $A^2(E_\rho - E_\delta) > 4E_M(B_0 + \nu)$: (11.3)
- $2E_M + AE_\delta + E_\delta < AE_M$: (11.6)
- $16\nu^2 B_1 E_\rho + 32\nu^2(B_0 + \nu)E_M < A$: (14.9)
- $A_1 E_\rho + (\nu + 2)A + (4\nu + 1) + 2E_\delta < AE_\delta/B_1$: (14.15)

5 Fourier analysis

In this section we perform a Fourier transform of our original equation. We begin by defining weighted sequence spaces (for the Fourier coefficients) and corresponding operator spaces. Similar classes of weights have been used in the context of small divisor problems by DeLatte [22], Craig and Wayne [10] and Bourgain [4]. The weights and norms we introduce in section 5.1 are well suited for a multi-scale analysis and have been presented by the author in [44].

5.1 Sequence and matrix spaces

The Fourier coefficients of the profile functions $\chi(\cdot;z)$ form sequences on the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$. For our analysis it is convenient to consider certain families of weighted ℓ_1 spaces. The corresponding weights belong to the following class which was already used in [17].

$$\mathcal{W} := \{w : \mathbb{Z}^\nu \to [1,\infty) \ : \ w(m) \leq w(n)w(m-n) \ \text{ for all } m,n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu\} \tag{5.1}$$

For weights $w \in \mathcal{W}$ we define the sequence space

$$\ell_{1,w} := \left\{ u : \mathbb{Z}^\nu \to \mathbb{C} \ : \ \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} w(m)|u(m)| < \infty \right\}. \tag{5.2}$$

It is easy to see that the space $\ell_{1,w}$ together with the norm

$$\|u\|_{\ell_{1,w}} := \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} w(m)|u(m)| \tag{5.3}$$

is a Banach space which is contained in ℓ_1. What will be important in our analysis is that the norms defined in (5.3) are sub-multiplicative with respect to convolution. For u, $v \in \ell_1$ set

$$(u * v)(m) := \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} u(m-n)v(n). \tag{5.4}$$

The following proposition is a straightforward consequence of definition (5.1) and the well known sub-multiplicativity of the ℓ_1 – norm under convolution.

Proposition 5.5 *Let $w \in \mathcal{W}$ and u, $v \in \ell_{1,w}$. Then $u * v \in \ell_{1,w}$ and*

$$\|u * v\|_{\ell_{1,w}} \leq \|u\|_{\ell_{1,w}} \|v\|_{\ell_{1,w}}. \tag{5.6}$$

For $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$ we have

$$\left(\sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} u(m)e^{i<m,\xi>}\right) \cdot \left(\sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} v(m)e^{i<m,\xi>}\right) = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} (u*v)(m)e^{i<m,\xi>} \tag{5.7}$$

and

$$(ue^{i<\cdot,\xi>}) * (ve^{i<\cdot,\xi>}) = (u*v)e^{i<\cdot,\xi>}. \tag{5.8}$$

Notation 5.9 *For $u \in \ell_1$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by*

$$u^{*k} := u * u * \ldots * u$$

the k-th convolution power of u.

Next we turn to spaces of linear operators on $\ell_{1,w}$. For $w \in \mathcal{W}$ we define

$$\mathcal{L}_w := \left\{ R : \mathbb{Z}^\nu \times \mathbb{Z}^\nu \to \mathbb{C} \ : \ \|R\|_w \equiv \sup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} w(m-n)|R(m,n)| < \infty \right\}. \tag{5.10}$$

It is not difficult to see that $(\mathcal{L}_w, \|\cdot\|_w)$ is a Banach space. Moreover, one can introduce matrix multiplication in $\mathcal{L}_w$ by setting

$$(RS)(m,n) := \sum_{p\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} R(m,p)S(p,n). \tag{5.11}$$

Indeed, for R, $S \in \mathcal{L}_w$, $w \in \mathcal{W}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ we conclude from (5.1)

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} w(m-n)|(RS)(m,n)| &\leq \sum_{m,p\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} w(m-p)|R(m,p)|w(p-n)|S(p,n)| \\ &\leq \sum_{p\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} \|R\|_w w(p-n)|S(p,n)| \\ &\leq \|R\|_w\|S\|_w. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the matrix RS lies in $\mathcal{L}_w$, satisfying

$$\|RS\|_w \leq \|R\|_w\|S\|_w. \tag{5.12}$$

One readily verifies that $\mathcal{L}_w$ forms an algebra (see, e.g. [48] for a definition) with unity I, $I(m,n) = \delta_{m,n}$. Furthermore, for $R \in \mathcal{L}_w$ and $u \in \ell_{1,w}$ we define $(Ru)(m) := \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} R(m,n)u(n)$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|Ru\|_{\ell_{1,w}} &= \sum_m w(m)\left|\sum_n R(m,n)u(n)\right| \leq \sum_{m,n} w(m-n)|R(m,n)|w(n)|u(n)| \\ &\leq \|R\|_w\|u\|_{\ell_{1,w}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

We summarize

Proposition 5.14 *Let $w \in \mathcal{W}$. Then $\mathcal{L}_w$ is a Banach algebra with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_w$. The space $\mathcal{L}_w$ is contained in the space $\mathcal{B}(\ell_{1,w})$ of bounded linear operators on $\ell_{1,w}$ and the corresponding operator norm in $\mathcal{B}(\ell_{1,w})$ is bounded above by $\|\cdot\|_w$.*

Finally, we introduce two particular families of weight functions in $\mathcal{W}$.

Definition 5.15 *Let ν, c and D_N be given by (2.11), (4.5) and (4.6). For $\sigma \geq 1/4$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ we set*

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\sigma,c}(n) &:= D_N e^{\sigma|n|^c}, \\ w_{\sigma,1}(n) &:= D_N(1+|n|)^{\nu+1}e^{\sigma|n|}. \end{aligned}$$

The following properties of the just defined weight functions will be used throughout our analysis.

Lemma 5.16 *For $\sigma \geq 1/4$ and $x \in \{c, 1\}$ the following holds.*

$$w_{\sigma,x} \in \mathcal{W} \tag{5.17}$$

$$\frac{1}{w_{\sigma,x}(n)} \geq \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} \frac{1}{w_{\sigma,x}(m)w_{\sigma,x}(n-m)} \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \tag{5.18}$$

$$w_{\sigma,x}(n) = w_{\sigma+\mu,x}(n)e^{-\mu|n|^x} \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu,\ \mu > 0 \tag{5.19}$$

$$\|u\|_{\sigma_1,x_1} \leq \|u\|_{\sigma_2,x_2} \quad \text{for all } \sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2,\ x_1 \leq x_2,\ u \in X_{\sigma_2,x_2}. \tag{5.20}$$

Proof. Properties (5.18), (5.19) and (5.20) follow immediately from the definition of $w_{\sigma,x}$ and from the definition of D_N (see (4.6), proposition 17.2). It is also clear that $w_{\sigma,x}(n) \geq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$. Finally, the sub-multiplicative property $w(n) \leq w(m)w(n-m)$ which appears in the definition of $\mathcal{W}$ is weaker than (5.18) and hence (5.17) follows. □

Property (5.17) shows that the sequence and matrix spaces corresponding to the weights $w_{\sigma,x}$ satisfy propositions 5.5 and 5.14. We introduce the following notation.

Definition 5.21

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\sigma,c} &:= \ell_{1,w_{\sigma,c}}, \quad X_{\sigma,1} := \ell_{1,w_{\sigma,1}}, \\ \mathcal{L}_{\sigma,c} &:= \mathcal{L}_{w_{\sigma,c}}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{\sigma,1} := \mathcal{L}_{w_{\sigma,1}}. \end{aligned}$$

By a slight abuse of notation the corresponding norms of the sequence spaces $X_{\sigma,c}$, $X_{\sigma,1}$ and of the matrix spaces $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,c}$, $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,1}$ are both denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{\sigma,c}$, $\|\cdot\|_{\sigma,1}$.

5.2 The equation for the Fourier coefficients

In this subsection we derive the equation for the Fourier coefficients.

Proposition 5.22 *Let F, b, γ be given as in theorem 2.19, satisfying assumptions A1 – A4. Recall the definitions of ν, g, c, $r_{F,b}$, α_k (see section 4 B) – D)). Suppose that for some $s_0 > 0$, $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$, and $u \in X_{1,c}$ the following five conditions hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{1,c} &< r_{F,b}, && (5.23)\\ u(0) &= 0, && (5.24)\\ u(-m) &= \overline{u(m)} \quad \textit{for all } m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu, && (5.25)\\ \textit{dist } (<\omega, m>, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) &\geq s_0 e^{-\frac{1}{2}|m|^c} \quad \textit{for all } m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus \{0\}, && (5.26)\\ \left(\alpha_1 - \frac{\gamma^2 < m, g >^2}{4\sin^2 \frac{<\omega,m>}{2}}\right) u(m) &= -\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \alpha_k u^{*k}(m) \quad \textit{for all } m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus \{0\}. && (5.27) \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$\tilde{u}(m) := \begin{cases} \frac{u(m)}{-2i\sin\frac{<\omega,m>}{2}} & , \textit{ if } m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus \{0\}, \\ 0 & , \textit{ if } m = 0, \end{cases} \tag{5.28}$$

and define

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(\xi) &:= \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} \tilde{u}(m) e^{i<m,\xi>} \quad \textit{for } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^\nu, && (5.29)\\ x_n(t) &:= nb + \chi(n\omega - \gamma t g) \quad \textit{for } t \in \mathbb{R}, n \in \mathbb{Z}. && (5.30) \end{aligned}$$

Then for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ the function x_n is real valued, smooth and $\frac{2\pi}{\gamma}$-periodic. The chain $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ satisfies

$$\ddot{x}_n(t) = F(x_{n-1}(t) - x_n(t)) - F(x_n(t) - x_{n+1}(t)) \quad \textit{for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}, t \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{5.31}$$

Proof. From condition (5.26) we deduce

$$\left|\sin\frac{<\omega, m>}{2}\right| \geq \frac{1}{\pi} s_0 e^{-\frac{1}{2}|m|^c} \quad \text{for } m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus \{0\}. \tag{5.32}$$

Using (5.3), definitions 5.15, 5.21 and $D_N \geq 1$ (see (4.6)) it follows that

$$|\tilde{u}(m)| \leq \frac{\pi\|u\|_{1,c}}{2s_0 w_{1,c}(m)} e^{\frac{1}{2}|m|^c} \leq \frac{\pi\|u\|_{1,c}}{2s_0} e^{-\frac{1}{2}|m|^c} \quad \text{for } m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu. \tag{5.33}$$

This estimate together with condition (5.25) implies that χ as defined in (5.29) is a real valued C^∞-function on the torus $\mathbb{T}^\nu$. The time periodicity of the functions x_n is obvious since all components of the vector g are integers.

It only remains to verify (5.31). From (5.30), (5.29), (5.28), and (5.24) we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} x_{n-1}(t) - x_n(t) &= -b + \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu} \tilde{u}(m)(e^{-i<m,\omega>} - 1)e^{i<m,\omega n - g\gamma t>} \\ &= -b + \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu} u(m) e^{-\frac{i}{2}<m,\omega>} e^{i<m,\omega n - g\gamma t>}. \end{aligned}$$

Using $w_{1,c}(m) \geq 1$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ and (5.23) we see that the Fourier series of $x_{n-1} - x_n + b$ converges absolutely with

$$|x_{n-1}(t) - x_n(t) + b| < \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu} |u(m)| \leq \|u\|_{1,c} < r_{F,b}. \tag{5.34}$$

Thus the following reorderings of summation are justified (see also proposition 5.5).

$$\begin{aligned} F(x_{n-1}(t) - x_n(t)) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k \left(x_{n-1}(t) - x_n(t) + b\right)^k \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k \left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu} u(m) e^{-\frac{i}{2}<m,\omega>} e^{i<m,\omega n - g\gamma t>} \right)^k \\ &= \alpha_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k \left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu} u^{*k}(m) e^{-\frac{i}{2}<m,\omega>} e^{i<m,\omega n - g\gamma t>} \right) \\ &= \alpha_0 + \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k u^{*k}(m) \right) e^{-\frac{i}{2}<m,\omega>} e^{i<m,\omega n - g\gamma t>}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$F(x_n(t) - x_{n+1}(t)) = \alpha_0 + \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k u^{*k}(m) \right) e^{\frac{i}{2}<m,\omega>} e^{i<m,\omega n - g\gamma t>}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{gathered} F(x_{n-1}(t) - x_n(t)) - F(x_n(t) - x_{n+1}(t)) = \\ \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k u^{*k}(m) \right) \left(-2i \sin \frac{<m,\omega>}{2} \right) e^{i<m,\omega n - g\gamma t>}. \end{gathered} \tag{5.35}$$

On the other hand, a straight forward calculation shows that

$$\ddot{x}_n(t) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu} \tilde{u}(m) \left(- <m,g>^2 \gamma^2 \right) e^{i<m,\omega n - g\gamma t>}. \tag{5.36}$$

It suffices to verify that the Fourier coefficients in (5.35) and (5.36) coincide, i.e. to show

$$\tilde{u}(m) \left(- <m,g>^2 \gamma^2 \right) = \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k u^{*k}(m) \right) \left(-2i \sin \frac{<m,\omega>}{2} \right) \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu. \tag{5.37}$$

For $m = 0$ both sides of equation (5.37) clearly vanish. For $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus \{0\}$ equation (5.37) follows from (5.27) and (5.28). □

6 The first induction step

The P – equation is solved by an inductive construction. In this section we formulate and prove the initial induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})_{j=1}$.

Estimates of lemma 4.54 used in section 6:

$$12D_N\nu 2^{\nu+1}e^2\rho_0 < r_{F,b} \tag{6.1}$$

$$50\nu\rho_1 N_1 \leq \delta_1 \tag{6.2}$$

$$\frac{s}{(2N_1+4)^\tau} \geq 3\delta_1 \tag{6.3}$$

$$\delta_1 < 2\delta_V \tag{6.4}$$

Induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})_{j=1}$ concerns the following quantities: $v_1 : U(B_{\rho_0}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2\rho_0) \to X_{2,1}$, $\mathcal{N}^{(1)} \subset \mathbb{R}^{2\nu}$, $K^{(1)} \subset \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda_k^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}^{2\nu}$ and $I_{C,k}^{(1)} \subset (-\pi,\pi)$ for $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(1)}$, $k \in K^{(1)}$.

Statement $(\mathcal{IS})_{j=1}$**:**

$\mathbf{(1)}_{j=1}$

(a) $v_1(\lambda) = 0$ for all $\lambda \in U(B_{\rho_0}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2\rho_0)$.

(b) The map $U(B_{\rho_0}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2\rho_0) \to X_{2,1}$, $\lambda \mapsto \mathcal{P}(v_1(\lambda),\lambda)$ is analytic and

$$\|\mathcal{P}(v_1(\lambda),\lambda)\|_{2,1} \leq D_W(2^{\nu+2}\nu D_N e^2)^2|a|^2 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in U(B_{\rho_0}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2\rho_0).$$

$\mathbf{(2)}_{j=1}$ $\mathcal{N}^{(1)} = \bigcup_{k\in K^{(1)}} B_{\rho_1}(\lambda_k^{(1)})$.

$\mathbf{(3)}_{j=1}$

(a) For each $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(1)}$ and $k \in K^{(1)}$ the set $I_{C,k}^{(1)}$ satisfies

$$I_{C,k}^{(1)} \subset \bigcup_{\mu\in\{0,\pm 2\omega_i^{(0)}\}} \{[\mu]\} + (-\delta_1,\delta_1).$$

Moreover, $I_{C,k}^{(1)}$ is a union of $\#(C\cap\mathcal{S})+1$ disjoint open intervals, such that $B(I_{C,k}^{(1)}, 2\delta_1)$ is again a union of $\#(C\cap\mathcal{S})+1$ disjoint intervals with $B(I_{C,k}^{(1)}, 2\delta_1) \subset (-\pi,\pi)$.

(b) For $\lambda = (a,\omega) \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)},\rho_1)$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ satisfying $0 < |m| \leq 2N_1$ we have

$\text{dist}\,(<\omega,m>, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) \geq sd_{\tau,c}e^{-\frac{1}{2}|m|^c}$.

(c) Let $k \in K^{(1)}$, $\lambda = (a,\omega) \in U(B_{\rho_1}(\lambda_k^{(1)}), \rho_1)$, $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(1)}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ with $0 < |m| \leq 2N_1$ and $< m, g >= 0$.

Then $< \omega, m > \in U(\mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{I}_{C,k}^{(1)}, \frac{\delta_1}{10})$, where $\tilde{I}_{C,k}^{(1)} \equiv I_{C,k}^{(1)} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ (cf. remark 3.36).

(d) Let $k \in K^{(1)}$, $\lambda = (a,\omega) \in U(B_{\rho_1}(\lambda_k^{(1)}), \rho_1)$, $\theta \in \mathbb{C}$, $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}^{(1)}$, $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ with $0 < |n-m| \leq 2N_1$ and $< m-n, g >= 0$.

Then $\theta + < \omega, m > \in U(\tilde{I}_{C_1,k}^{(1)}, \frac{\delta_1}{10})$ implies $\theta + < \omega, n > \in \mathbb{C} \setminus U(\tilde{I}_{C_2,k}^{(1)}, \frac{\delta_1}{10})$.

$\mathbf{(4)}_{j=1}$ Let $k \in K^{(1)}$, $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(1)}$, $m \in \mathcal{S} \cap C$, and $(\theta, \lambda) \in U(\mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{I}_{C,k}^{(1)}, \frac{\delta_1}{10}) \times U(B_{\rho_1}(\lambda_k^{(1)}), \rho_1)$. Then $|V(\theta,\omega)(m)| > \frac{d_V \delta_1}{2}$.

Lemma 6.5 *There exist v_1, $\mathcal{N}^{(1)}$, $K^{(1)}$, $\lambda_k^{(1)}$ (for $k \in K^{(1)}$), $I_{C,k}^{(1)}$ (for $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(1)}$, $k \in K^{(1)}$) such that statement $(\mathcal{IS})_{j=1}$ is satisfied.*

Proof. $\mathbf{(1)}_{j=1}$: Statement (a) forces the definition $v_1(\lambda) := 0$ for all $\lambda \in U(B_{\rho_0}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2\rho_0)$. To show (b) observe that $\mathcal{P}(v_1(\lambda), \lambda) = PW(\varphi(a))$. Definitions (3.9), 5.15, and 5.21 together with (6.1) imply for $\lambda \in U(B_{\rho_0}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2\rho_0)$ that

$$\|\varphi(a)\|_{2,1} \leq D_N 2\nu 2^{\nu+1} e^2 |a| < 6 D_N \nu 2^{\nu+1} e^2 \rho_0 < \frac{r_{F,b}}{2}.$$

Lemma 18.1 then implies analyticity of the function $\mathcal{P}(v_1(\cdot), \cdot)$ on $U(B_{\rho_0}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2\rho_0)$. The same lemma 18.1 also yields

$$\|\mathcal{P}(v_1(\lambda), \lambda)\|_{2,1} = \|PW(\varphi(a))\|_{2,1} \leq \|W(\varphi(a))\|_{2,1} \leq D_W (2^{\nu+2} \nu D_N e^2)^2 |a|^2.$$

$\mathbf{(2)}_{j=1}$: We set

$$\mathcal{N}^{(1)} := B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)}), \tag{6.6}$$
$$K^{(1)} := \{1\}, \tag{6.7}$$
$$\lambda_1^{(1)} := \lambda^{(0)}. \tag{6.8}$$

The claim is obvious.

$\mathbf{(3)}_{j=1}$: For $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(1)}$, $k \in K^{(1)}$ we define

$$I_{C,k}^{(1)} := (-\delta_1, \delta_1) \cup \bigcup_{e_i \in C} ([-2\omega_i^{(0)}] - \delta_1, [-2\omega_i^{(0)}] + \delta_1) \cup \bigcup_{-e_i \in C} ([2\omega_i^{(0)}] - \delta_1, [2\omega_i^{(0)}] + \delta_1). \tag{6.9}$$

In order to prove statement (a) it suffices to show the following two conditions.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{dist}(\mu_1-\mu_2, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) &\geq 6\delta_1 \quad \text{for } \mu_1,\mu_2 \in \{0, \pm 2\omega_i^{(0)}\},\ \mu_1 \neq \mu_2. \\ \mathrm{dist}(\mu, (2\pi+1)\mathbb{Z}) &\geq 3\delta_1 \quad \text{for } \mu \in \{0, \pm 2\omega_i^{(0)}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Both estimates follow from assumption A3 and from $s/(4^\tau) \geq 6\delta_1$ which in turn is a consequence of (6.3). Statement (b) follows from (6.6), assumption A3, (6.2), (6.3) and (4.24). Indeed, let $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}, \rho_1)$, $0 < |m| \leq 2N_1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{dist}\ (<\omega, m>, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) &\geq \mathrm{dist}\ (<\omega^{(0)}, m>, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) - \nu(2\rho_1)(2N_1) \\ &\geq \frac{s}{|m|^\tau} - \frac{\delta_1}{10} \\ &\geq \frac{s}{2|m|^\tau} \\ &\geq s d_{\tau,c} e^{-\frac{1}{2}|m|^c}. \end{aligned}$$

We prove claim (c) by contradiction. Assume that there exist $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}, \rho_1)$, $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(1)}$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ with $0 < |m| \leq 2N_1$, $<m, g>= 0$, such that

$$<\omega, m> \in \mathbb{C} \setminus U(\mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{I}_{C,1}^{(1)}, \frac{\delta_1}{10}).$$

Again (6.2) implies $| <\omega, m> - <\omega^{(0)}, m> | < \delta_1/10$ and therefore

$$<\omega^{(0)}, m> \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (\mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{I}_{C,1}^{(1)}) = \tilde{I}_{C,1}^{(1)}.$$

From the definition of $\tilde{I}_{C,1}^{(1)} \equiv I_{C,1}^{(1)} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ and (6.9) it follows that there exist $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $m_1 \in \mathcal{S} \cup \{0\}$, such that

$$| <\omega^{(0)}, m> - 2\pi l - 2 <\omega^{(0)}, m_1> | < \delta_1$$

This implies dist $(<\omega^{(0)}, m - 2m_1>, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) < \delta_1$. By assumption A3 and (6.3) it then follows that $m = 2m_1$. Since $m_1 \in \mathcal{S} \cup \{0\}$ the condition $0 =< m, g >=< 2m_1, g >$ can only be satisfied, if $m_1 = 0$ and hence $m = 0$. However, this contradicts the assumption $|m| > 0$.

Claim (d) is also proved by contradiction. Assume there exist $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}, \rho_1)$, $\theta \in \mathbb{C}$, $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}^{(1)}$, $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ with $0 < |m - n| \leq 2N_1$, $< m - n, g >= 0$, and numbers $\theta_1 \in I_{C_1,1}^{(1)}$, $\theta_2 \in I_{C_2,1}^{(1)}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{dist}(\theta + <\omega, m> - \theta_1, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) &< \frac{\delta_1}{10}, \qquad (6.10) \\ \mathrm{dist}(\theta + <\omega, n> - \theta_2, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) &< \frac{\delta_1}{10}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of the sets $I^{(1)}_{C,k}$ there exist $m_1, n_1 \in \mathcal{S} \cup \{0\}$, such that

$$\mathrm{dist}(\theta_1 - 2 < \omega^{(0)}, m_1 >, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) < \delta_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{dist}(\theta_2 - 2 < \omega^{(0)}, n_1 >, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) < \delta_1.$$

Substituting θ_1 and θ_2 in (6.10) and taking the difference of the inequalities of (6.10) we obtain

$$\mathrm{dist}(< \omega, m - n > -2 < \omega^{(0)}, m_1 - n_1 >, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) < \frac{22}{10}\delta_1. \tag{6.11}$$

Using $|m-n| \leq 2N_1$ and (6.2) we conclude that the distance of $< \omega^{(0)}, m-n-2(m_1-n_1) >$ to some integer multiple of 2π is less than $3\delta_1$. Assumption A3 together with (6.3) imply $m-n-2(m_1-n_1) = 0$. From $< m-n, g >= 0$ we see that $< m_1, g >=< n_1, g >$. Recall that $m_1, n_1 \in \mathcal{S} \cup \{0\}$ and therefore we must have $m_1 = n_1$. Thus $m - n = 0$, contradicting the assumption $|m - n| > 0$.
$\mathbf{(4)}_{j=1}$: Let $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(1)}$, $m \in \mathcal{S} \cap C$ and $(\theta, \lambda) \in U(\mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{I}^{(1)}_{C,1}, \frac{\delta_1}{10}) \times U(B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(1)}_1), \rho_1)$. We write $m = \mu e_i$ with $\mu \in \{-1, 1\}$ and $i \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$. From definition (6.9) it follows that

$$\{0, -2\mu\omega^{(0)}_i\} + (-\delta_1, \delta_1) + 2\pi\mathbb{Z} \subset \tilde{I}^{(1)}_{C,1}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{dist}\ (\theta, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) &\geq 9\delta_1/10, \\ \mathrm{dist}\ (\theta, \{-2\mu\omega^{(0)}_i\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) &\geq 9\delta_1/10. \end{aligned}$$

By (6.2) we have $|\omega_i - \omega^{(0)}_i| < \delta_1/3$, implying

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{dist}\ (\theta + \mu\omega_i, \{\mu\omega^{(0)}_i\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) &> \frac{1}{2}\delta_1, \\ \mathrm{dist}\ (\theta + \mu\omega_i, \{-\mu\omega^{(0)}_i\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) &> \frac{1}{2}\delta_1. \end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

Since $\theta+ < \omega, m >= \theta + \mu\omega_i$ we conclude from (4.12), proposition 19.1 (a) and (6.4) that

$$|V(\theta, \omega)(m)| = |V_i(\theta + \mu\omega_i)| > \frac{d_V\delta_1}{2}.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 6.5. □

7 The induction statement for $j \geq 2$

In this section we formulate the induction statements for $j \geq 2$. They concern the following quantities $v_j : U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}, \rho_1) \to X_{1,c}$, $\mathcal{N}^{(j)} \subset \mathcal{N}^{(1)}$, index sets $K^{(j)}$ and $K^{(j-0.5)}$, vectors $\lambda^{(j)}_k \in \mathcal{N}^{(1)}$

($k \in K^{(j)}$), sets $I^{(j)}_{C,k}$ ($k \in K^{(j)}$, $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(j)}$) and sets of polynomials $\mathcal{POL}^{(j)}_{\tilde{k}} \subset \mathcal{POL}$ ($\tilde{k} \in K^{(j-0.5)}$). The proof that such functions exist will stretch over sections 8 – 11.

Statement $(\mathcal{IS})_{j\geq 2}$**:**

$\mathbf{(1)}_{j\geq 2}$

(a) $v_j : U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}, \rho_1) \to X_{1,c}$ is a C^∞ – function (if $U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}, \rho_1)$ is considered as a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{4\nu}$).

(b) The restriction of the function v_j to the set $U(\mathcal{N}^{(j-1)}, \rho_{j-1}/4)$ is analytic.

(c) The map $\lambda \mapsto \mathcal{P}(v_j(\lambda), \lambda)$ has an analytic continuation to $U(\mathcal{N}^{(j-1)}, \rho_{j-1}/4)$ and

$$\|\mathcal{P}(v_j(\lambda), \lambda)\|_{1/4,c} \leq e^{-N^c_{j-1}}|a|^2 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j-1)}, \rho_{j-1}/4).$$

(d) For all $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}, \rho_1)$:

$$\|v_j(\lambda) - v_{j-1}(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \leq \begin{cases} 4e^6\nu^2 D_W D_N^2 D_\tau N_0^{\tau+1}|a|^2 & \text{if } j = 2, \\ e^{-\frac{1}{8}N^c_{j-2}}|a|^2 & \text{if } j > 2. \end{cases}$$

(e) For all $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}, \rho_1)$:

$$\|\partial^\beta(v_j - v_{j-1})(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \leq \begin{cases} \beta! 36 e^6\nu^2 D_W D_N^2 D_E(|\beta|_1) N_0^{E_\rho(|\beta|_1-1)} & \text{if } j = 2, \\ \beta! e^{2\nu} D_\psi(|\beta|_1)\left(\frac{8}{\rho_{j-1}}\right)^{|\beta|_1} e^{-\frac{1}{8}N^c_{j-2}} & \text{if } j > 2. \end{cases}$$

(f) For all $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}, \rho_1)$ the support of $v_j(\lambda)$ is contained in $B_{N_{j-1}}(0) \setminus (\mathcal{S} \cup \{0\})$.

(g) For all $\lambda \in B(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}, \rho_1)$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ we have $v_j(\lambda)(m) = v_j(\lambda)(-m) \in \mathbb{R}$.

(h) Let $\lambda = (a, \omega) \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}, \rho_1)$ with $a_i = 0$, for some $1 \leq i \leq \nu$. Then $v_j(\lambda)(m) = 0$, if $m_i \neq 0$.

$\mathbf{(2)}_{j\geq 2}$

(a) $\mathcal{N}^{(j)} = \bigcup_{k \in K^{(j)}} B_{\rho_j}(\lambda^{(j)}_k) \subset \mathcal{N}^{(j-1)}$.

(b) For $\tilde{k} \in K^{(j-0.5)}$ the following inclusion holds:

$$\left(\overline{\mathcal{N}^{(j-1)}} \setminus \overline{\mathcal{N}^{(j)}}\right) \cap \overline{B_{\tilde{\rho}_{j-1}}\left(\lambda^{(j-0.5)}_{\tilde{k}}\right)}$$
$$\subset \bigcup_{\substack{(p,\vartheta) \in \mathcal{POL}^{(j)}_{\tilde{k}} \\ 2N_{j-1} < |m| \leq 2N_j}} \begin{array}{l} \{\lambda \in \overline{B_{\tilde{\rho}_{j-1}}(\lambda^{(j-0.5)}_{\tilde{k}})} : |[<\omega, m>] - \vartheta| \leq \frac{\delta_1}{2} \text{ and} \\ \qquad |p([<\omega, m>] - \vartheta, \lambda)| < (D_K + 1)\delta_j\}. \end{array}$$

(c) $\mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j)} \subset \mathcal{POL}$ and $\#\mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j)} \leq 2(2N_{j-1})^{4\nu}\delta_{j-1}^{-2}$.

$\mathbf{(3)}_{j\geq 2}$ Let $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(j)}$ and $k \in K^{(j)}$. Denote $C' := C \cap B_{1.5}(0)$, if $j = 2$, respectively $C' := C \cap B_{N_{j-2}}(0)$, if $j > 2$ and $k' := \pi_{j-1}^{(j)}k$.

(a) $I_{C,k}^{(j)} \subset I_{C',k'}^{(j-1)}$ is an open set.

(b) For $\lambda = (a,\omega) \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j)$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ with $2N_{j-1} < |m| \leq 2N_j$:

$$\text{dist }(<\omega, m>, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) \geq s d_{\tau,c} e^{-\frac{1}{2}|m|^c}.$$

(c) For $k \in K^{(j)}$, $\lambda = (a,\omega) \in U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda_k^{(j)}), \rho_j)$, $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(j)}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ with $2N_{j-1} < |m| \leq 2N_j$ and $< m, g >= 0$:

$$<\omega, m> \in U(\mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{I}_{C,k}^{(j)}, \frac{\delta_j}{10}),$$

where $\tilde{I}_{C,k}^{(j)} \equiv I_{C,k}^{(j)}$ (see remark 3.36).

(d) For $k \in K^{(j)}$, $\lambda = (a,\omega) \in U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda_k^{(j)}), \rho_j)$, $\theta \in \mathbb{C}$, $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}^{(j)}$, $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ with $2N_{j-1} < |n-m| \leq 2N_j$ and $< m-n, g >= 0$:

$$\theta + <\omega, m> \in U(\tilde{I}_{C_1,k}^{(j)}, \frac{\delta_j}{10}) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \theta + <\omega, n> \in \mathbb{C} \setminus U(\tilde{I}_{C_2,k}^{(j)}, \frac{\delta_j}{10}).$$

$\mathbf{(4)}_{j\geq 2}$ Let $k \in K^{(j)}$, $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(j)}$ and define the corresponding C', k' as in $\mathbf{(3)}_j$. There exists a map $(\theta,\lambda) \mapsto G_C^{(j)}(\theta,\lambda)$ which is analytic on $U(\tilde{I}_{C',k'}^{(j-1)} \setminus \tilde{I}_{C,k}^{(j)}, \delta_j/10) \times U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda_k^{(j)}), \rho_j)$, satisfying

$$\|G_C^{(j)}(\theta,\lambda)\|_{\sigma_j,c} \leq M_j \quad \text{for } (\theta,\lambda) \in U(\tilde{I}_{C',k'}^{(j-1)} \setminus \tilde{I}_{C,k}^{(j)}, \delta_j/10) \times U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda_k^{(j)}), \rho_j). \tag{7.1}$$

Furthermore, $G_C^{(j)}(\theta,\lambda)$ is the inverse of the matrix $T_C^{(j)}(\theta,\lambda)$ (the restriction of the matrix $T^{(j)}(\theta,\lambda)$ (see (4.11)) to the set C) for all $(\theta,\lambda) \in U(\tilde{I}_{C',k'}^{(j-1)} \setminus \tilde{I}_{C,k}^{(j)}, \delta_j/10) \times U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda_k^{(j)}), \rho_j) \setminus \tilde{Z}_C$. The entries of $G_C^{(j)}(\theta,\lambda)$ are real for real values of (θ,λ).

8 The construction of v_{j+1} for $j = 1$

In this section we construct v_2 from v_1 by a modified Newton scheme. The induction hypothesis $(\mathcal{IS})(3c)_{j=1}$ and $(\mathcal{IS})(4)_{j=1}$ will imply that the diagonal parts of the linearized operators dominate the corresponding off-diagonal parts. The linearized operators can be inverted by a Neumann series.

Observe, that the dependence of the estimates $(\mathcal{IS})(1e)_{j=2}$ on the order of the derivative $|\beta|_1$ is better than one could derive from the analyticity of v_2 (see $(\mathcal{IS})(1b)_{j=2}$) and from statement $(\mathcal{IS})(1d)_{j=2}$ via Cauchy's formula. The improvement we have gained for estimates $(\mathcal{IS})(1e)_{j=2}$ will be crucial for obtaining lower bounds on the measure of the set of non-resonant parameters in section 14.

Estimates of lemma 4.54 used in section 8:

$$2^{2\nu+4}e^6\nu^2 D_W D_N^2 \le e^{\frac{1}{2}N_1^c} \tag{8.1}$$

$$c \le \frac{A-1}{A}\frac{\log 1.5}{\log 5} \tag{8.2}$$

$$E_\rho \ge \tau + 2 \tag{8.3}$$

$$6\nu N_0^{\tau+1-E_\rho} \le s \tag{8.4}$$

$$\frac{s}{2N_0^\tau} < \delta_V \tag{8.5}$$

$$\alpha_1 > \frac{d_V s}{2N_0^\tau} \tag{8.6}$$

$$\frac{(\nu+1)^2\gamma^2}{4\cosh^2(\nu N_0^{1-E_\rho})} - \alpha_1 > \frac{d_V s}{2N_0^\tau} \tag{8.7}$$

$$12e^6\nu^2 D_W D_N^2 D_\tau N_0^{\tau+1}\rho_0 < 1 \tag{8.8}$$

$$(2^{\nu+2}\nu e^2 D_N + 1)3\rho_0 < \frac{r_{F,b}}{2} \tag{8.9}$$

$$3(2^{\nu+2}\nu e^2 D_N + 1)D_N\frac{2N_0^{\tau-E_\rho}}{d_V s} < \frac{1}{2} \tag{8.10}$$

$$2^{2\nu+4}\frac{D_N^2}{d_V s} \le N_0 \tag{8.11}$$

$$3(2^{\nu+2}\nu e^2 D_N + 1) \le N_0 \tag{8.12}$$

$$12e^3\nu D_W D_N \le N_0 \tag{8.13}$$

Lemma 8.14 *Assume that induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})_{j=1}$ holds. Then there exists a function $v_2 : U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}, \rho_1) \to X_{1,c}$ such that induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})(1)_{j=2}$ is satisfied.*

Proof. By (4.43), (4.44), (4.13) there exists a $p_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N_1 = N_0 5^{p_0}$. For $1 \le p \le p_0 + 1$ define

$$L_p \;:=\; N_0 5^{p-1}, \tag{8.15}$$

$$B_p \;:=\; B_{L_p}(0) \setminus (\mathcal{S} \cup \{0\}) \subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu, \tag{8.16}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_p &:= 1+\frac{1}{p}, && (8.17)\\ r_p &:= L_p^{-E_\rho}. && (8.18) \end{aligned}$$

For $1 \le p \le p_0+1$ we construct inductively analytic maps $z_p : U(B_{r_p}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_p) \to X_{\mu_p,1}$ satisfying

(i) For all $\lambda \in U(B_{r_p}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_p)$:

$$\begin{aligned} z_p(\lambda) &= 0 && \text{if } p=1,\\ \|(z_p - z_{p-1})(\lambda)\|_{\mu_{p-1},1} &\le 4e^6\nu^2 D_W D_N^2 L_p^{\tau+1} e^{-1.5^{p-1}}|a|^2 && \text{if } 2 \le p \le p_0+1. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) For all $\lambda \in U(B_{r_p}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_p)$ the support of $z_p(\lambda)$ is contained in B_p.

(iii) For all $\lambda \in B(B_{r_p}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_p)$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ we have $z_p(\lambda)(m) = z_p(\lambda)(-m) \in \mathbb{R}$.

(iv) Let $\lambda = (a,\omega) \in U(B_{r_p}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_p)$ with $a_i = 0$, for some $1 \le i \le \nu$. Then $z_p(\lambda)(m) = 0$, if $m_i \ne 0$.

(v) The map $\lambda \mapsto \mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda), \lambda)$ has an analytic continuation to $U(B_{r_p}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_p)$ and

$$\|\mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda),\lambda)\|_{\mu_p,1} \le 2^{2\nu+4} e^6 \nu^2 D_W D_N^2 e^{-1.5^p}|a|^2 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in U(B_{r_p}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_p).$$

Suppose that for $1 \le p \le p_0+1$ there exist analytic functions z_p, satisfying (i)-(v). We verify that

$$v_2 := z_{p_0+1}|_{U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)},\rho_1)} \tag{8.19}$$

satisfies $(\mathcal{IS})(1)_{j=2}$. Observe that (4.45), (4.15) together with the definitions of p_0, L_p and r_p given at the beginning of this proof imply $L_{p_0+1} = N_1$ and $r_{p_0+1} = \rho_1$. Since $\mu_{p_0+1} \ge 1$, $c < 1$ (see (4.5), (5.20)) and $\mathcal{N}^{(1)} = B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)})$ (see (6.6)) it is clear that v_2 is a well defined map from $U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}, \rho_1)$ into $X_{1,c}$ satisfying properties (a) and (b) of $(\mathcal{IS})(1)_{j=2}$. Furthermore conditions (f), (g), (h) follow from properties (ii), (iii), (iv) of z_{p_0+1}. It remains to verify that v_2 satisfies statements (c), (d) and (e) of $(\mathcal{IS})(1)_{j=2}$:

Proof of(c): Using (8.1), property (v) of z_{p_0+1} and (5.20) we only need to show that

$$1.5^{p_0} \ge N_1^c. \tag{8.20}$$

Recall that p_0 was chosen to satisfy $N_0 5^{p_0} = N_1$. By (4.44) we have $N_1 = N_0^A$ and therefore $p_0 \log 5 = (A-1)\log N_0$. Consequently, (8.20) can be written in the form

$$(A-1)\frac{\log 1.5}{\log 5} \ge Ac. \tag{8.21}$$

This in turn follows from (8.2).

Proof of (d): Since $v_1(\lambda) \equiv 0$ and $z_1(\lambda) \equiv 0$ we conclude from (i) and (8.15) that

$$\|(v_2 - v_1)(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \leq \|(z_{p_0+1} - z_1)(\lambda)\|_{1,1} \leq 4e^6\nu^2 D_W D_N^2 N_0^{\tau+1}|a|^2 \sum_{p=1}^{p_0} 5^{p(\tau+1)} e^{-1.5^p} \tag{8.22}$$

for all $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}, \rho_1)$. Claim (d) follows from the definition of the constant D_τ in (4.22).

Proof of (e): Note that the estimate on $z_p - z_{p-1}$ in (i) holds on a complex $2r_p$-neighborhood of $B_{r_p}(\lambda^{(0)})$. Furthermore, we have $r_p \geq \rho_1$ for all $1 \leq p \leq p_0 + 1$ and therefore Cauchy's integral formula implies for $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}, \rho_1)$, $1 \leq p \leq p_0$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial^\beta(z_{p+1} - z_p)(\lambda)\|_{1,1} &\leq \beta! r_{p+1}^{-|\beta|_1} 4e^6\nu^2 D_W D_N^2 L_{p+1}^{\tau+1} e^{-1.5^p}(3r_{p+1})^2 \\ &\leq \beta! 36e^6\nu^2 D_W D_N^2 L_{p+1}^{\tau+1} r_{p+1}^{2-|\beta|_1} e^{-1.5^p}. \end{aligned} \tag{8.23}$$

From (8.3) and (8.18) it follows that $L_{p+1}^{\tau+1} < r_{p+1}^{-1}$. A calculation similar to (8.22) yields for $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}, \rho_1)$

$$\|\partial^\beta(v_2 - v_1)(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \leq \beta! 36e^6\nu^2 D_W D_N^2 N_0^{E_\rho(|\beta|_1-1)} \sum_{p=1}^{p_0} 5^{pE_\rho(|\beta|_1-1)} e^{-1.5^p}. \tag{8.24}$$

Claim (e) follows from the definition of $D_E(x)$ in (4.23).

We have therefore reduced the proof of lemma 8.14 to showing that there exists a finite sequence $(z_p)_{1\leq p\leq p_0+1}$ of analytic maps $z_p : U(B_{r_p}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_p) \to X_{\mu_p,1}$ satisfying properties (i)-(v).

Inductive construction of z_p:

$\underline{p = 1:}$ By (i) the choice of $z_1(\lambda) \equiv 0$ is determined for all $\lambda \in U(B_{r_1}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_1)$. This choice clearly satisfies also (ii), (iii) and (iv). Since $r_1 = N_0^{-E_\rho} = \rho_0$ we have $v_1 = z_1$ and property (v) follows from $(\mathcal{IS})(1)_{j=1}$ (b).

$\underline{p \to p+1 \text{ for } 1 \leq p \leq p_0:}$ Set

$$T_p(\lambda) := D_v\mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda), \lambda)|_{B_{p+1}}. \tag{8.25}$$

We first investigate the invertibility of $T_p(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in U(B_{r_{p+1}}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_{p+1})$. To that end we split

$$T_p = D + R, \tag{8.26}$$

where $D(m,n) = V(\omega)(m)\delta_{m,n}$ and $R = DW(\varphi(a) + z_p(\lambda))|_{B_{p+1}}$. We will show in steps 1 and 2 below that the diagonal matrix D dominates R and that we can find the inverse of T_p by a

Neumann series (step 3). In step 4 we define z_{p+1} and show that z_{p+1} is analytic and satisfies properties (i)-(iv). In a final step we verify condition (v).

Step 1: Estimates on D. We prove that for all $\lambda \in U(B_{r_{p+1}}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_{p+1})$ and $m \in B_{p+1}$

$$|V(\omega)(m)| > \frac{d_V s}{2L_{p+1}^{\tau}}. \tag{8.27}$$

Case 1: $1 \leq |<m, g>| \leq \nu$.

Set $l := |<m, g>|$, then $V(\omega)(m) = V_l(<\omega, m>)$. Since $|\omega - \omega^{(0)}| < 3r_{p+1}$, it follows from assumption A3, $m \pm e_l \neq 0$ (since $m \notin \mathcal{S}$), and (8.4) that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist } (<\omega, m>, \{\pm\omega_l^{(0)}\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) &> \text{dist } (<\omega^{(0)}, m \mp e_l>, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) - 3\nu r_{p+1} L_{p+1} \\ &\geq \frac{s}{L_{p+1}^{\tau}} - 3\nu r_{p+1} L_{p+1} \geq \frac{s}{2L_{p+1}^{\tau}}. \end{aligned}$$

Estimate (8.27) follows from proposition 19.1 (a) together with (8.5).

Case 2: $<m, g> = 0$.

By definition $V(\omega) = \alpha_1$ and (8.27) follows from (8.6).

Case 3:$|<m, g>| \geq \nu + 1$.

Observe that $|\operatorname{Im}(<\omega, m>)| \leq 2\nu L_{p+1}^{1-E_\rho} \leq 2\nu N_0^{1-E_\rho}$, since $E_\rho > 1$ (cf. (8.3)). Estimate (8.27) then follows from (8.7).

Step 2: Estimates on R. Using statement (i) of the induction hypothesis, the definition of D_τ ((4.22), see also (8.22)) and $\mu_p \leq 2$ we obtain with (8.8) and (8.9)

$$\|\varphi(a) + z_p(\lambda)\|_{\mu_p,1} \leq D_N 2^{\nu+2}\nu e^2 |a| + 4e^6\nu^2 D_W D_N^2 D_\tau N_0^{\tau+1} |a|^2 < \frac{r_{F,b}}{2}. \tag{8.28}$$

Thus lemma 18.1 can be applied and again by (8.8) we conclude for $\lambda \in U(B_{r_{p+1}}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_{p+1})$

$$\|R\|_{\mu_p,1} \leq 3(2^{\nu+2}\nu e^2 D_N + 1) r_{p+1}. \tag{8.29}$$

Step 3: Construction of T_p^{-1}. It follows from (8.27) that D^{-1} exists and

$$\|D^{-1}\|_{\mu_p,1} \leq D_N \frac{2L_{p+1}^{\tau}}{d_V s}. \tag{8.30}$$

Using (8.29) and (8.10) we see that $\|D^{-1}R\|_{\mu_p,1} < 1/2$ and we can invert $I + D^{-1}R$ by a Neumann series with bound $\|(I + D^{-1}R)^{-1}\|_{\mu_p,1} \leq \|I\|_{\mu_p,1} + 1 \leq 2D_N$. Therefore $G_p := (I + D^{-1}R)^{-1}D^{-1}$ exists and by (8.11)

$$\|G_p(\lambda)\|_{\mu_p,1} \leq 4D_N^2 \frac{L_{p+1}^{\tau}}{d_V s} \leq 2^{-(2\nu+2)} L_{p+1}^{\tau+1} \tag{8.31}$$

for all $\lambda \in U(B_{r_{p+1}}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_{p+1})$. Note that G_p depends analytically on λ, since D^{-1} and R are analytic in $U(B_{r_{p+1}}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_{p+1})$. Moreover $G_p(\lambda) = T_p^{-1}(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in U(B_{r_{p+1}}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_{p+1}) \setminus Z_{B_{p+1}}$ (see (3.40)).

Step 4: Definition of z_{p+1} and proof of properties (i)-(iv). We set for $\lambda \in U(B_{r_{p+1}}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_{p+1})$

$$z_{p+1}(\lambda) := z_p(\lambda) - G_p(\lambda)\left[\mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda), \lambda)|_{B_{p+1}}\right]. \tag{8.32}$$

Clearly, z_{p+1} is an analytic function on its domain of definition. Property (i) is an immediate consequence of induction hypothesis (v), (8.31) and proposition 5.14. Property (ii) is obvious, since $z_{p+1}(m)$ vanishes outside B_{p+1} by construction. For $\lambda \in B(B_{r_{p+1}}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_{p+1})$ we have by induction hypothesis that $z_p(\lambda)(m) = z_p(\lambda)(-m) \in \mathbb{R}$, implying $\mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda), \lambda)(m) = \mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda), \lambda)(-m) \in \mathbb{R}$ by the definition of $\mathcal{P}$ (see (3.13)) and the analyticity of $\mathcal{P}(z_p(\cdot), \cdot)$. It then follows from proposition 19.15(a) and $B_{p+1} = -B_{p+1}$ that z_{p+1} also satisfies property (iii). To prove (iv) assume that $a_i = 0$ for some $1 \le i \le \nu$. By induction hypothesis $z_p(\lambda)(m) = 0$, if $m_i \neq 0$. One readily verifies from the definition that $\mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda), \lambda)(m) = 0$ for $m_i \neq 0$. Furthermore, proposition 19.15 (b) shows that the matrix T_p is of block form $T_p(m, n) = 0$ for $m_i - n_i \neq 0$. Of course, the block form is preserved under inversion of the matrix. This implies $z_{p+1}(\lambda)(m) = 0$ for $m_i \neq 0$.

Step 5: Proof of property (v). To prove analyticity of the function $\mathcal{P}(z_p(\cdot), \cdot)$ across $Z_{B_{p+1}}$ we need to convince ourselves of the analyticity of $D(z_{p+1} - z_p)$ at the singularities of the diagonal matrix D. From (8.32) it follows for $\lambda \in U(B_{r_{p+1}}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_{p+1}) \setminus Z_{B_{p+1}}$ that

$$D(z_{p+1} - z_p)(\lambda) = -\mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda), \lambda)|_{B_{p+1}} + R(\lambda)G_p(\lambda)\mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda), \lambda)|_{B_{p+1}}, \tag{8.33}$$

which clearly has an analytic continuation across $Z_{B_{p+1}}$. To obtain an estimate on $\mathcal{P}(z_{p+1}(\lambda), \lambda)$ we expand

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}(z_{p+1}(\lambda), \lambda) &= [\mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda), \lambda) + T_p(\lambda)(z_{p+1}(\lambda) - z_p(\lambda))] \\
&\quad + [(D_v\mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda), \lambda) - T_p(\lambda))(z_{p+1}(\lambda) - z_p(\lambda))] \\
&\quad + \left[\int_0^1 (1-t) D^2_{vv}\mathcal{P}(z_p + t(z_{p+1} - z_p), \lambda)[z_{p+1} - z_p, z_{p+1} - z_p]dt\right] \\
&= I + II + III.
\end{aligned}$$

By continuity it suffices to show that the following three estimates hold for all
$\lambda \in U(B_{r_{p+1}}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_{p+1}) \setminus Z_{B_{p+1}}$.

$$\|I\|_{\mu_{p+1},1} \;\le\; \frac{1}{3}2^{2\nu+4}e^6\nu^2 D_W D_N^2 e^{-1.5^{p+1}}|a|^2, \tag{8.34}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|II\|_{\mu_{p+1},1} &\leq \frac{1}{3}2^{2\nu+4}e^6\nu^2 D_W D_N^2 e^{-1.5^{p+1}}|a|^2, && (8.35)\\
\|III\|_{\mu_{p+1},1} &\leq \frac{1}{3}2^{2\nu+4}e^6\nu^2 D_W D_N^2 e^{-1.5^{p+1}}|a|^2. && (8.36)
\end{aligned}
$$

From (8.32), (5.19) it follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|I\|_{\mu_{p+1},1} &= \|\mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda),\lambda) - \mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda),\lambda)|_{B_{p+1}}\|_{\mu_{p+1},1}\\
&\leq \|\mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda),\lambda)\|_{\mu_p,1} e^{-(\mu_p-\mu_{p+1})L_{p+1}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the induction hypothesis and (8.17) it suffices to show that

$$
3e^{-1.5^p} e^{-\frac{1}{p(p+1)}L_{p+1}} \leq e^{-1.5^{p+1}}, \tag{8.37}
$$

or equivalently

$$
a_p := \log 3 + \frac{1}{2}1.5^p \leq \frac{1}{p(p+1)} N_0 5^p =: b_p. \tag{8.38}
$$

Inequality (8.38) follows inductively: one verifies easily that $0 < a_1 \leq b_1$ (observe that $N_0 \geq 5$ by (4.43)) and that

$$
\frac{a_{p+1}}{a_p} \leq 1.5 < \frac{5}{3} \leq \frac{b_{p+1}}{b_p} \quad \text{for } p \in \mathbb{N}.
$$

Thus (8.34) is proved.

It follows from the definition of $T_p(\lambda)$ in (8.25) and from $\operatorname{supp}((z_{p+1}-z_p)(\lambda)) \subset B_{p+1}$ that

$$
\begin{aligned}
(II)(m) &= 0 \quad \text{for } |m| < L_{p+1}, && (8.39)\\
(II)(m) &= \sum_{n\in B_{p+1}} R(m,n)(z_{p+1}-z_p)(n) \quad \text{for } |m| \geq L_{p+1}. && (8.40)
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence we obtain

$$
\|II\|_{\mu_{p+1},1} \leq \|R\|_{\mu_p,1}\|z_{p+1}-z_p\|_{\mu_p,1} e^{-(\mu_p-\mu_{p+1})L_{p+1}}. \tag{8.41}
$$

Using (8.29), the already proven property (i), (8.3), and (8.12) we observe that (8.35) follows from (8.37).

Using (8.28) and the estimates leading to (8.28) we see that both

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\varphi(a) + z_p(\lambda)\|_{\mu_p,1} &\leq \frac{r_{F,b}}{2} \quad \text{and}\\
\|\varphi(a) + z_{p+1}(\lambda)\|_{\mu_p,1} &\leq \frac{r_{F,b}}{2}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore $\|\varphi(a) + z_p(\lambda) + t(z_{p+1} - z_p)(\lambda)\|_{\mu_p,1} \leq r_{F,b}/2$ for all $\lambda \in U(B_{r_{p+1}}(\lambda^{(0)}), 2r_{p+1})$ and $0 \leq t \leq 1$. We can apply lemma 18.1 and obtain

$$\|III\|_{\mu_p,1} \leq D_W \|z_{p+1} - z_p\|^2_{\mu_p,1}. \tag{8.42}$$

Estimate (8.36) follows from property (i), and from (8.3), (8.13). □

9 The construction of v_{j+1} for $j \geq 2$

In the case $j \geq 2$ we also construct v_{j+1} from v_j by a modified Newton scheme. In contrast to the previous section, the inverse of the linearized operators cannot be obtained by a Neumann series. However, induction hypothesis $(\mathcal{IS})(3c)_{1\leq l\leq j}$ and $(\mathcal{IS})(4)_{1\leq l\leq j}$ imply that we can find sufficiently many local inverse matrices such that the coupling lemma 20.1 can be applied. We derive estimates on the inverse of the linearized operators which are sufficient for the Newton scheme to work.

Estimates of lemma 4.54 used in section 9:

$$\frac{1}{8}N_1^c(5^c - 1) \geq \log 2 \tag{9.1}$$

$$4\rho_j \leq \rho_{j-1} \tag{9.2}$$

$$2\alpha_1 > d_V\delta_1 \tag{9.3}$$

$$\frac{(\nu+1)^2\gamma^2}{4\cosh^2(\nu N_0^{1-E_\rho}/2)} - \alpha_1 > \frac{d_V\delta_1}{2} \tag{9.4}$$

$$4D_W e^{-\frac{1}{8}N_{l-1}^c} M_l \leq 1 \quad \text{for } 2 \leq l \leq j \tag{9.5}$$

$$16e\nu D_N\rho_1 \leq r_{F,b} \tag{9.6}$$

$$8e^5\nu D_W D_N D_\tau N_0^{\tau+1}\rho_1 \leq 1 \tag{9.7}$$

$$8\rho_1 \leq e\nu D_N \tag{9.8}$$

$$64e\nu D_W D_N^2 \rho_1 \leq d_V\delta_1 \tag{9.9}$$

$$4D_N M_l e^{-\frac{1}{4l(l+1)}N_{l-1}^c} \leq 1 \quad \text{for } 2 \leq l \leq j \tag{9.10}$$

$$M_2 \geq \frac{2}{d_V\delta_1} \tag{9.11}$$

$$4D_N^2 \leq N_1 \tag{9.12}$$

$$N^{AE_M+1} \leq e^{\frac{1}{16}N^c} \quad \text{for all } N \geq N_1 \tag{9.13}$$

$$5^c \leq \frac{19}{18} \tag{9.14}$$

$$3(4e\nu D_N)^2 D_W \le e^{\frac{3}{4}N_1^c} \tag{9.15}$$

$$8e\nu D_W D_N \rho_1 \le 1 \tag{9.16}$$

$$3 \le e^{\frac{1}{8}N_1^c} \tag{9.17}$$

Lemma 9.18 *Let $j \ge 2$ and suppose that $(\mathcal{IS})_l$ is satisfied for $1 \le l \le j$. Then there exists a function $v_{j+1} : U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}, \rho_1) \to X_{1,c}$ satisfying induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})(1)_{j+1}$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of lemma 8.14. Again we will construct v_{j+1} from v_j by a modified Newton scheme. The main difference, however, is that the existence of (and estimates on) the inverse of the linearized operator does not follow from the dominance of the diagonal part. Instead we use the induction hypothesis and the coupling lemma 20.1.

By definitions (4.43), (4.44) and (4.13) there exists a $p_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N_j = N_{j-1}5^{p_0}$. For $1 \le p \le p_0 + 1$ define

$$\begin{aligned} L_p &:= N_{j-1}5^{p-1}, && (9.19)\\ B_p &:= B_{L_p}(0) \setminus (\mathcal{S} \cup \{0\}) \subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu. && (9.20) \end{aligned}$$

We construct inductively analytic maps $z_p : U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j) \to X_{1,c}$, $1 \le p \le p_0 + 1$, such that the following holds:

(i) For all $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j)$:

$$\begin{aligned} z_p(\lambda) &= v_j(\lambda) && \text{for } p = 1,\\ \|(z_p - z_{p-1})(\lambda)\|_{1,c} &\le e^{-\frac{1}{8}L_p^c}|a|^2 && \text{for } 2 \le p \le p_0 + 1. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) For all $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j)$ the support of $z_p(\lambda)$ is contained in B_p.

(iii) For all $\lambda \in B(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j)$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ we have $z_p(\lambda)(m) = z_p(\lambda)(-m) \in \mathbb{R}$.

(iv) Let $\lambda = (a, \omega) \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j)$ with $a_i = 0$, for some $1 \le i \le \nu$. Then $z_p(\lambda)(m) = 0$, if $m_i \ne 0$.

(v) The map $\lambda \mapsto \mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda), \lambda)$ has an analytic continuation to $U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j)$ and

$$\|\mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda), \lambda)\|_{1/4,c} \le e^{-L_p^c}|a|^2 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j).$$

We will first complete the proof of Lemma 9.18, assuming that such functions z_p exist. Recall the definition of the function ψ in section 4 G). For $\epsilon > 0$ set

$$\psi_\epsilon(x) \;:=\; \epsilon^{-4\nu}\psi\left(\frac{x}{\epsilon}\right) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^{4\nu}. \tag{9.21}$$

Furthermore we denote

$$X^{(j)} \;:=\; U\left(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \frac{\rho_j}{2}\right) \subset \mathbb{C}^{2\nu} \equiv \mathbb{R}^{4\nu}, \tag{9.22}$$

$$\Psi^{(j)}(x) \;:=\; \int_{X^{(j)}} \psi_{\rho_j/8}(x-y)dy. \tag{9.23}$$

It is easy to see that the cut-off function $\Psi^{(j)} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{4\nu})$ has the following properties:

$$\Psi^{(j)}(x) \;=\; 1 \quad \text{for } x \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j/4), \tag{9.24}$$

$$\operatorname{supp}(\Psi^{(j)}) \;\subset\; U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, 3\rho_j/4), \tag{9.25}$$

$$0 \leq \Psi^{(j)}(x) \;\leq\; 1 \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^{4\nu}, \tag{9.26}$$

$$\left|\partial^\beta \Psi^{(j)}(x)\right| \;\leq\; \left(\frac{8}{\rho_j}\right)^{|\beta|_1} D_\psi(|\beta|_1) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^{4\nu}. \tag{9.27}$$

We define

$$v_{j+1}(\lambda) := \begin{cases} v_j(\lambda) + (z_{p_0+1}(\lambda) - v_j(\lambda))\Psi^{(j)}(\lambda) & \text{for } \lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j), \\ v_j(\lambda) & \text{for } \lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}, \rho_1) \setminus U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j) \end{cases} \tag{9.28}$$

From (9.25) we conclude that v_{j+1} is a C^∞ function. Furthermore, by (9.24), v_{j+1} coincides with z_{p_0+1} on the set $U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j/4)$ and is therefore analytic on this set. Thus we have already verified properties (1a) and (1b) of the induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})_{j+1}$. By definition (see (9.19)) we have $L_{p_0+1} = N_j$. Statement (c) of $(\mathcal{IS})_{j+1}$ is an immediate consequence of (9.24) and property (v) of z_{p_0+1}. Note that for $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j)$

$$v_{j+1}(\lambda) - v_j(\lambda) \;=\; \Psi^{(j)}(\lambda)y(\lambda) \quad \text{with} \tag{9.29}$$

$$y(\lambda) := \sum_{p=1}^{p_0} z_{p+1}(\lambda) - z_p(\lambda). \tag{9.30}$$

The estimate (i) on $z_p - z_{p-1}$ together with $e^{-\frac{1}{8}L_{p+1}^c} \leq \frac{1}{2}e^{-\frac{1}{8}L_p^c}$ for $1 \leq p \leq p_0$ (a consequence of (9.1)) yields

$$\|z_{p+1}(\lambda) - z_p(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \leq 2^{-p}e^{-\frac{1}{8}N_{j-1}^c}|a|^2$$

and therefore

$$\|y(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \leq e^{-\frac{1}{8}N_{j-1}^c}|a|^2 \quad \text{for } \lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j). \tag{9.31}$$

Since $|\Psi^{(j)}(\lambda)| \leq 1$ (see (9.26)) we have proved statement (d) of $(\mathcal{IS})_{j+1}$. Furthermore, by the analyticity of y in $U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j)$ the Cauchy integral formula implies

$$\|\partial^\beta y(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \leq \beta! \left(\frac{4}{\rho_j}\right)^{|\beta|_1} e^{-\frac{1}{8}N_{j-1}^c} \quad \text{for } \lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, 3\rho_j/4). \tag{9.32}$$

Applying the Leibniz rule to the right hand side of (9.29) statement (1e) of $(\mathcal{IS})_{j+1}$ now follows from (9.25), (9.27), (9.29) and (9.32). Statements (1f), (1g) and (1h) of $(\mathcal{IS})_{j+1}$ follow by (9.25) and (9.28) from the corresponding properties of v_j (see (1f), (1g), (1h) of $(\mathcal{IS})_j$) and of z_{p_0+1} (see (ii), (iii) and (iv) and recall that $L_{p_0+1} = N_j$ by the definition of p_0.)

Thus the proof of Lemma 9.18 is reduced to constructing analytic maps $z_p : U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j) \to X_{1,c}$, satisfying properties (i)-(v).

Inductive construction of z_p:

$\underline{p = 1}$: By (i) the choice of $z_1(\lambda) = v_j(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j)$, is determined. Since $U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j) \subset U(\mathcal{N}^{(j-1)}, \rho_{j-1}/4)$ (see (9.2), $(\mathcal{IS})(2a)_j$), it follows from $(\mathcal{IS})_j(1b)$ that z_1 is analytic. Recall furthermore that L_1 as defined in (9.19) equals N_{j-1} and properties (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v) are satisfied for z_1 by statements (1f), (1g), (1h) and (1c) of $(\mathcal{IS})_j$.

$\underline{p \to p+1,\ 1 \leq p \leq p_0}$: Define

$$T_p(\lambda) := D_v\mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda), \lambda)|_{B_{p+1}} \quad \text{for } \lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j) \setminus Z_{B_{p+1}}. \tag{9.33}$$

In order to see that (9.33) is well defined, we first show that

$$\|\varphi(a) + z_p(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \leq 4e\nu D_N|a| \leq \frac{r_{F,b}}{2} \quad \text{for } \lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j). \tag{9.34}$$

Indeed, for $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi(a) + z_p(\lambda)\|_{1,c} &\leq \|\varphi(a)\|_{1,c} + \|v_2(\lambda) - v_1(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \\ &+ \|v_j(\lambda) - v_2(\lambda)\|_{1,c} + \|z_p(\lambda) - v_j(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \\ &= I + II + III + IV, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$I \leq 2\nu|a|D_N e,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
II &\leq 4e^6\nu^2 D_W D_N^2 D_\tau N_0^{\tau+1}|a|^2 \leq e\nu D_N|a| \ \ (\text{ see } (\mathcal{IS})(1d)_2, (9.7)),\\
III &\leq \sum_{l=3}^{j} \|v_l - v_{l-1}\|_{1,c} \leq \sum_{l=3}^{j} e^{-\frac{1}{8}N_{l-2}^c}|a|^2 \leq 4e^{-\frac{1}{8}N_1^c}\rho_1|a|\\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}e\nu D_N|a| \quad (\text{ see } (\mathcal{IS})(1d)_l, (9.1), (9.8)),\\
IV &\leq \sum_{l=2}^{p} \|z_l - z_{l-1}\|_{1,c} \leq \sum_{l=2}^{p} e^{-\frac{1}{8}L_l^c}|a|^2 \leq 2e^{-\frac{1}{8}N_{j-1}^c}\rho_1|a| \qquad (9.35)\\
&\leq \frac{1}{4}e\nu D_N|a| \quad (\text{ see } (i), (9.1), (9.8)).
\end{aligned}$$

Using in addition (9.6) we have proved (9.34).

Claim1:

There exists an analytic map $\lambda \mapsto G_p(\lambda)$ on $U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j)$ satisfying

$$\|G_p(\lambda)\|_{\sigma_{j+1},c} \leq L_p^{AE_M+1} \quad \textit{for } \lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j). \tag{9.36}$$

Moreover, for $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j) \setminus Z_{B_{p+1}}$ the matrix $G_p(\lambda)$ is the inverse of $T_p(\lambda)$.

Proof of claim 1: Let $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j)$. Then there exists a (not necessarily unique) $k_j \in K^{(j)}$ such that $\lambda \in U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda_{k_j}^{(j)}), \rho_j)$. Set $k_l := \pi_l^{(j)} k_j$ for $1 \leq l \leq j-1$. The definition of the projection $\pi_l^{(j)}$ (section 4 J) together with (9.2) imply

$$\lambda \in U\left(B_{\rho_l}(\lambda_{k_l}^{(l)}), \frac{\rho_l}{4}\right) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq l \leq j-1. \tag{9.37}$$

We set

$$E_0 := \{m \in B_{p+1} : | < m, g > | \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \nu\}\}. \tag{9.38}$$

For each $m \in E_0$ we denote by $m' \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ the (uniquely defined) lattice point satisfying $< m', g >= 0$ and $m - m' \in \mathcal{S}$. Furthermore, we define for $n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$

$$C_l(n) \ := \ \begin{cases} (B_{p+1} - \{n\}) \cap B_{1.5}(0) & \text{if } l = 1,\\ (B_{p+1} - \{n\}) \cap B_{N_{l-1}}(0) & \text{if } 2 \leq l \leq j. \end{cases} \tag{9.39}$$

Observe that for $m \in E_0$ with $|m'| > 2N_{l-1}$, $l \geq 2$, the sets $C_s(m')$ are elements of $\mathcal{C}^{(s)}$ for all $1 \leq s \leq l$. Indeed, $m - m' \in \mathcal{S} \cap C_s(m')$ by definition. Moreover, it is also obvious from (9.39) that $C_s(m') \subset B_{N_{s-1}}(0)$ for $2 \leq s \leq l$, respectively $C_1(m') \subset B_{1.5}(0)$. To see that $C_s(m')$ is an interval in the case $2 \leq s \leq l$ we employ $|m| \geq 2N_{l-1}$. Hence the following is a proper definition.

$$\Gamma_l \ := \ \left\{m \in E_0 : |m'| > 2N_{l-1} \text{ and } < \omega, m' > \in U\left(\tilde{I}_{C_{l-1}(m'),k_{l-1}}^{(l-1)} \setminus \tilde{I}_{C_l(m'),k_l}^{(l)}, \frac{\delta_l}{10}\right)\right\}$$

$$\text{for } 2 \leq l \leq j, \tag{9.40}$$

$$\Gamma_1 \quad := \quad B_{p+1} \setminus \left(\bigcup_{l=2}^{j} \Gamma_l \right). \tag{9.41}$$

The definition of the sets Γ_l is motivated by the following properties:

(α) For all $m \in \Gamma_1$: $|V(\omega)(m)| > \frac{d_V \delta_1}{2}$.

(β) $\Gamma_l \subset \{m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu : |m| \geq 2N_{l-1}\}$ for $2 \leq l \leq j$.

(γ) For $2 \leq l \leq j$ and $m \in \Gamma_l$ we have

$$\left\| \left((T_p)(\lambda)|_{C_l(m')+\{m'\}} \right)^{-1} \right\|_{\sigma_l, c} \leq 2D_N M_l \quad \text{(cf. remark 9.43 below).} \tag{9.42}$$

Remark 9.43 *In the proof of claim 1 we have chosen an arbitrary but fixed* $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j)$. *Since the matrix* $T_p(\lambda)|_{C_l(m')+\{m'\}}$ *does not have finite entries for* $\lambda \in Z_{C_l(m')+\{m'\}}$ *we need to interpret statement (γ) in this case. We understand by claim (γ) the following. There exists an open neighborhood* U_λ *of* λ *and an analytic map* $\mu \mapsto G(\mu)$ *defined on* U_λ*, such that* $G(\mu)$ *is the inverse of* $(T_p)(\mu)|_{C_l(m')+\{m'\}}$ *for* $\mu \in U_\lambda \setminus Z_{C_l(m')+\{m'\}}$. *Moreover,* $G(\lambda)$ *satisfies estimate (9.42).*

Proof of (α): Let $m \in \Gamma_1$.

Case 1: $m \in B_{p+1} \setminus E_0$. Suppose first that $< m, g >= 0$. Then $V(\omega)(m) = \alpha_1$ and the claim follows from (9.3). Therefore we may assume that $| < m, g > | \geq \nu + 1$. Since the imaginary part of $< \omega, m >$ is bounded by $\nu \rho_j N_j \leq \nu N_0^{1-E_\rho}$, the claim follows from (9.4).

Case 2: $m \in E_0$. Recall that definition (9.20) implies $\mathcal{S} \cap B_{p+1} = \emptyset$. Furthermore, m' has been chosen such that $m - m' \in \mathcal{S}$ and hence we have

$$0 < |m'| \leq N_j. \tag{9.44}$$

We can define $l \in \{1, ..., j\}$ to be the minimal integer such that $|m'| \leq 2N_l$ is satisfied. Since $k_l \in K^{(l)}$, $\lambda \in U(B_{\rho_l}(\lambda_{k_l}^{(l)}), \rho_l)$, $C_l(m') \in \mathcal{C}^{(l)}$, $< m', g >= 0$ and $0 < |m'| \leq 2N_1$ for $l = 1$, respectively, $2N_{l-1} < |m'| \leq 2N_l$ for $2 \leq l \leq j$, the inductive statement $(\mathcal{IS})(3c)_l$ implies that

$$< \omega, m' > \in U \left(\mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{I}^{(l)}_{C_l(m'), k_l}, \frac{\delta_l}{10} \right). \tag{9.45}$$

Observe that the definition of $C_s(m')$ and k_s together with the induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})(3a)_s$ yield

$$\tilde{I}^{(s)}_{C_s(m'), k_s} \subset \tilde{I}^{(s-1)}_{C_{s-1}(m'), k_{s-1}} \quad \text{for } 2 \leq s \leq j. \tag{9.46}$$

Thus

$$\mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{I}^{(l)}_{C_l(m'),k_l} = \mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{I}^{(1)}_{C_1(m'),k_1} \cup \bigcup_{s=2}^{l} \left(\tilde{I}^{(s-1)}_{C_{s-1}(m'),k_{s-1}} \setminus \tilde{I}^{(s)}_{C_s(m'),k_s} \right) \tag{9.47}$$

The definition of Γ_1 (see (9.41)) implies $m \notin \Gamma_s$ for $2 \le s \le j$. It follows from (9.45), (9.47) and (9.40) that

$$< \omega, m' > \in U \left(\mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{I}^{(1)}_{C_1(m'),k_1}, \frac{\delta_l}{10} \right). \tag{9.48}$$

Clearly, we have $\delta_l \le \delta_1$. Induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})(4)_1$ ($k \equiv k_1$, $C \equiv C_1(m')$) implies

$$|V(< \omega, m' >, \omega)(m - m')| > \frac{d_V \delta_1}{2}. \tag{9.49}$$

Claim (α) now follows from $V(< \omega, m' >, \omega)(m - m') = V(0, \omega)(m) = V(\omega)(m)$ which is a consequence of $< m', g >= 0$ (cf. (2.16), (3.31)).

Proof of (β): Obvious from (9.40) and $|m - m'| = 1$.

Proof of (γ): Let $m \in \Gamma_l$ for $2 \le l \le j$. Recall that $C_l(m') \in \mathcal{C}^{(l)}$. Furthermore

$$(< \omega, m' >, \lambda) \in U \left(\tilde{I}^{(l-1)}_{C_{l-1}(m'),k_{l-1}} \setminus \tilde{I}^{(l)}_{C_l(m'),k_l}, \frac{\delta_l}{10} \right) \times U \left(B_{\rho_l}(\lambda^{(l)}_{k_l}), \rho_l \right). \tag{9.50}$$

Induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})(4)_l$ provides the existence of an inverse matrix $G^{(l)}_{C_l(m')}(< \omega, m' >, \lambda)$ which clearly has an analytic continuation to some neighborhood U_λ of λ. Using proposition 19.18 and $< m', g >= 0$ we have found an inverse matrix of $T^{(l)}_{C_l(m')+\{m'\}}(0, \lambda)$ (see remark 9.43) with

$$\left\| \left(T^{(l)}_{C_l(m')+\{m'\}} \right)^{-1} (0, \lambda) \right\|_{\sigma_l, c} \le M_l. \tag{9.51}$$

According to proposition 24.11 claim (γ) follows, if we can show that

$$\left\| \left(T_p(\lambda) - T^{(l)}(0, \lambda) \right) |_{C_l(m')+\{m'\}} \right\|_{\sigma_l, c} \le \frac{1}{2M_l}. \tag{9.52}$$

Estimate (9.52), however, is a consequence of (9.33), lemma 18.1, induction hypothesis (i), induction statements $(\mathcal{IS})(1d)_s$ for $l < s \le j$, (9.1) and (9.5):

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left(T_p(\lambda) - T^{(l)}(0, \lambda) \right) |_{C_l(m')+\{m'\}} \right\|_{\sigma_l, c} \\ \le \; & \| DW(\varphi(a) + z_p(\lambda)) - DW(\varphi(a) + v_l(\lambda)) \|_{1,c} \\ \le \; & D_W \| z_p(\lambda) - v_l(\lambda) \|_{1,c} \\ \le \; & D_W \left(\sum_{s=l+1}^{j} \| v_s(\lambda) - v_{s-1}(\lambda) \|_{1,c} + \sum_{q=2}^{p} \| z_q(\lambda) - z_{q-1}(\lambda) \|_{1,c} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \; D_W \left(\sum_{s \geq l+1} e^{-\frac{1}{8} N_{s-2}^c} + \sum_{q \geq 2} e^{-\frac{1}{8} L_q^c} \right) \\ &\leq \; 2 D_W e^{-\frac{1}{8} N_{l-1}^c} \leq \frac{1}{2 M_l}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of statements (α) – (γ) and we return to the proof of claim 1. To this end we apply the coupling lemma 20.1. In the notation of lemma 20.1 we set

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda &\equiv B_{p+1}, \\ T_p(\lambda) &\equiv T = D + R, \text{ where} \\ D(m,n) &= V(\omega)(m) \delta_{m,n}, \\ R(m,n) &= DW(\varphi(a) + z_p(\lambda))(m,n), \\ \sigma &\equiv 1, \\ \tilde{\sigma} &\equiv \sigma_{j+1}. \end{aligned} \tag{9.53}$$

Let us first assume that $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j) \setminus Z_{B_{p+1}}$. Observe from (9.34) and lemma 18.1 that

$$\|R\|_{1,c} \leq 8 e \nu D_W D_N \rho_1. \tag{9.54}$$

Next we have to define the quantities l_n, μ_n, C_n and $U(n)$ for each $n \in B_{p+1}$. By definition (9.41) we have $B_{p+1} = \bigcup_{s=1}^{j} \Gamma_s$. Therefore we can pick for every $n \in B_{p+1}$ a (not necessarily unique) integer $s_n \in \{1, \ldots, j\}$ such that $n \in \Gamma_{s_n}$. In the case $s_n = 1$ we set

$$l_n := 1, \quad \mu_n := 0, \quad C_n := \tfrac{4 D_N}{d_V \delta_1}, \quad U(n) := \{n\}. \tag{9.55}$$

Recall that for $n \in \Gamma_l$, $l \geq 2$, we have $n \in E_0$ and therefore there exists an unique $n' \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ satisfying $< n', g >= 0$ and $n - n' \in \mathcal{S}$. In the case $s_n \geq 2$ we define

$$l_n := N_{s_n - 1} - 1, \quad \mu_n := \sigma_{s_n} - \sigma_{j+1}, \quad C_n := 2 D_N M_{s_n}, \quad U(n) := C_{s_n}(n') + \{n'\}. \tag{9.56}$$

We now verify the hypothesis (20.3) – (20.5) of lemma 20.1.

Case $s_n = 1$: The set $U(n)$ contains the single point n and

$$|D(n,n) + R(n,n)| \geq \frac{d_V \delta_1}{2} - \|R\|_{1,c} \geq \frac{d_V \delta_1}{4}$$

by (α) and (9.9). Hence (20.3) is satisfied. Condition (20.4) is clear and condition (20.5) follows again from (9.9) and (9.54).

Case $2 \leq s_n \leq j$*:* Condition (20.3) is satisfied by statement (γ) and (20.4) follows from the definition of $C_{s_n}(n')$ (cf. (9.39)) and $|n - n'| = 1$. Finally, condition (20.5) is satisfied by (4.7), (9.10) and (9.16).

We can apply lemma 20.1 and obtain that the inverse matrix $T_p(\lambda)^{-1}$ exists satisfying a matrix $G_{B_{p+1}}$ satisfying

$$\|T_p(\lambda)^{-1}\|_{\sigma_{j+1},c} \leq 2D_N \max\left(\frac{4D_N}{d_V \delta_1}, 2D_N M_j\right).$$

Keeping (9.11), (9.12), (4.44) and (4.48) in mind we obtain

$$\|T_p(\lambda)^{-1}\|_{\sigma_{j+1},c} \leq 4D_N^2 M_j \leq N_1 N_{j-1}^{AE_M} \leq L_p^{AE_M+1}. \tag{9.57}$$

Recall that we have assumed for the construction of $T_p(\lambda)^{-1}$ that $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j) \setminus Z_{B_{p+1}}$. For $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j) \cap Z_{B_{p+1}}$ not all entries of $T_p(\lambda)$ are finite and therefore we have to explain what we we understand by $T_p(\lambda)^{-1}$ (see e.g. remark 9.43). Observe from the proof of lemma 20.1 that the construction of T_Λ^{-1} only uses $T_{U(n)}^{-1}$ and R. The diagonal matrix D which contains the singularities does not appear. Note furthermore that $T_{U(n)}^{-1}$ is defined (in the sense of remark 9.43) also for $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j) \cap Z_{B_{p+1}}$ (see (γ) and remark 9.43 for $2 \leq s_n \leq j$; in the case $s_n = 1$ simply use $1/\infty \equiv 0$ to define $T_{\{n\}}^{-1}$ in the case $D(n,n) = \infty$). Thus we may extend the definition of $T_p(\lambda)^{-1}$ to the set $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j) \cap Z_{B_{p+1}}$ via lemma 20.1. Estimate (9.57) holds for this extension, too. We denote the extension of $T_p(\lambda)^{-1}$ to all of $U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j)$ by $G_p(\lambda)$.

In conclusion, we have constructed $G_p(\lambda)$ for every $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j)$ such that (9.36) is satisfied and $G_p(\lambda) = T_p^{-1}(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j) \setminus Z_{B_{p+1}}$. In order to prove claim 1 we still need to show analyticity of $G_p(\cdot)$. Fix again $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j)$. It is clear from the above construction that $G_p(\lambda)$ has an analytic continuation $A(\mu)$ to an open neighborhood U_λ of λ (cf. remark 9.43), satisfying $A(\mu) = T_p^{-1}(\mu)$ for all $\mu \in U_\lambda \setminus Z_{B_{p+1}}$. Nevertheless, by construction it is not a-priori clear that $A(\mu) = G_p(\mu)$ for $\mu \in U_\lambda \setminus \{\lambda\}$ since e.g. the choice of the local neighborhoods $U(n)$ (see (9.55), (9.56)) might differ for different values of λ. However, we observe that $A(\mu) = G_p(\mu)$ for all $\mu \in U_\lambda \setminus Z_{B_{p+1}}$ since they are both inverse to $T_p(\mu)$. Suppose now that $\lambda' \in U_\lambda \cap Z_{B_{p+1}}$. By the same reasoning as above there exists an open neighborhood $U_{\lambda'}$ of λ' and an analytic function B on $U_{\lambda'}$ such that $B(\lambda') = G_p(\lambda')$ and $B(\mu) = T_p^{-1}(\mu)$ for all $\mu \in U_{\lambda'} \setminus Z_{B_{p+1}}$. Thus $A(\mu) = B(\mu)$ for all $\mu \in U_\lambda \cap U_{\lambda'} \setminus Z_{B_{p+1}}$ and since $Z_{B_{p+1}}$ is a set of measure 0 the functions A and B coincide on $U_\lambda \cap U_{\lambda'}$ by analyticity. This implies in particular that $A(\lambda') = B(\lambda') = G_p(\lambda')$. We have shown that $A(\mu) = G_p(\mu)$ for all $\mu \in U_\lambda$ which in turn implies the analyticity of the function G_p at the point λ. The proof of claim 1 is complete.

Next we define z_{p+1}. Set

$$\tilde{B}_{p+1} := B_{p+1} \cap B_{3L_p}(0), \tag{9.58}$$

and denote by $\chi_{\tilde{B}_{p+1}}$ the corresponding characteristic function on $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$. For $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j)$ we define

$$z_{p+1}(\lambda) := z_p(\lambda) - G_p(\lambda)\left[\chi_{\tilde{B}_{p+1}} \mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda), \lambda)\right]. \tag{9.59}$$

From claim 1 and induction hypothesis (v) it follows that z_{p+1} is an analytic map from $U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j)$ into $X_{1,c}$. Moreover, property (v) of the induction hypothesis, $\sigma_{j+1} \geq 1/4$ (see (4.7)), and (9.57) yield

$$\|z_{p+1}(\lambda) - z_p(\lambda)\|_{1/4,c} \leq L_p^{AE_M+1} e^{-L_p^c} |a|^2. \tag{9.60}$$

Using in addition hypothesis (9.13), (9.14) and $\mathrm{supp}(z_{p+1}) \subset B_{p+1}$ we obtain

$$\|z_{p+1}(\lambda) - z_p(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \leq L_p^{AE_M+1} e^{-L_p^c} e^{\frac{3}{4}L_{p+1}^c} |a|^2 \leq e^{-L_{p+1}^c(\frac{15}{16}5^{-c} - \frac{3}{4})} |a|^2 \leq e^{-\frac{1}{8}L_{p+1}^c} |a|^2, \tag{9.61}$$

proving property (i). Property (ii) is clear by construction. The proof of properties (iii) and (iv) is similar to the corresponding proof in section 8 and will not be repeated here. It remains to show (v). Again, analyticity of the function $\mathcal{P}(z_{p+1}(\cdot), \cdot)$ can be dealt with in exactly the same way as in section 8, where one uses that $DG_p = I - RG_p$ is analytic. We expand

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}(z_{p+1}(\lambda), \lambda) \quad &= \quad \left[\mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda), \lambda) - \chi_{\tilde{B}_{p+1}} \mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda), \lambda)\right] \\
&+ \quad \left[\chi_{\tilde{B}_{p+1}} \mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda), \lambda) + T_p(\lambda)(z_{p+1}(\lambda) - z_p(\lambda))\right] \\
&+ \quad [(D_v \mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda), \lambda) - T_p(\lambda))(z_{p+1}(\lambda) - z_p(\lambda))] \\
&+ \quad \left[\int_0^1 (1-t) D_{vv}^2 \mathcal{P}(z_p + t(z_{p+1} - z_p), \lambda)[z_{p+1} - z_p, z_{p+1} - z_p]dt\right] \\
&= \quad I + II + III + IV.
\end{aligned} \tag{9.62}$$

Since $II = 0$ by definition (9.59) it suffices to show that for $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j)}, \rho_j) \setminus Z_{B_{p+1}}$ the following estimates hold:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|I\|_{1/4,c} \quad &\leq \quad \frac{1}{3} e^{-L_{p+1}^c} |a|^2, & (9.63) \\
\|III\|_{1/4,c} \quad &\leq \quad \frac{1}{3} e^{-L_{p+1}^c} |a|^2, & (9.64) \\
\|IV\|_{1/4,c} \quad &\leq \quad \frac{1}{3} e^{-L_{p+1}^c} |a|^2. & (9.65)
\end{aligned}$$

Estimate on (I): Since the support of z_p is contained in $B_{L_p}(0)$, definition (9.58) implies

$$\mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda),\lambda) - \chi_{\tilde{B}_{p+1}}\mathcal{P}(z_p(\lambda),\lambda) = W(\varphi(a) + z_p(\lambda))\chi_{\{|m|\geq 3L_p\}}. \tag{9.66}$$

Furthermore we have $\|\varphi(a) + z_p(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \leq r_{F,b}/2$ by (9.34). We can therefore apply lemma 18.1. Using in addition (9.14) and (9.15) we obtain

$$\|I\|_{1/4,c} \leq D_W(4e\nu D_N)^2 e^{-\frac{9}{4}L_p^c}|a|^2 \leq \frac{1}{3}e^{-L_{p+1}^c}|a|^2,$$

proving (9.63).

Estimate on (III): Using (9.59), (9.53), (9.54), (9.16), (9.57), induction hypothesis (v), (9.13) and (9.14) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|III\|_{1/4,c} = & \sum_{|n|\geq L_{p+1}, m_1\in B_{p+1}, |m_2|<3L_p} |R(n,m_1)||G_p(m_1,m_2)||\mathcal{P}(z_p,\lambda)(m_2)|w_{1/4,c}(n) \\
\leq\ & \sum_{\cdots} |R(n,m_1)||G_p(m_1,m_2)|w_{1/4,c}(n-m_2)|\mathcal{P}(z_p,\lambda)(m_2)|w_{1/4,c}(m_2) \\
\leq\ & \sum_{\cdots} |R(n,m_1)||G_p(m_1,m_2)|w_{1/2,c}(n-m_2)e^{-\frac{1}{4}|n-m_2|^c}|\mathcal{P}(z_p,\lambda)(m_2)|w_{1/4,c}(m_2) \\
\leq\ & e^{-\frac{1}{4}(2L_p)^c}\sum_{\cdots} |R(n,m_1)|w_{1/2,c}(n-m_1)|G_p(m_1,m_2)|w_{1/2,c}(m_1-m_2)|\mathcal{P}(z_p,\lambda)(m_2)|w_{1/4,c}(m_2) \\
\leq\ & e^{-\frac{1}{4}(2L_p)^c}\|R\|_{1/2,c}\|G_p\|_{1/2,c}\|\mathcal{P}(z_p,\lambda)\|_{1/4,c} \\
\leq\ & e^{-\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{2}{5}\right)^c L_{p+1}^c} L_p^{AE_M+1} e^{-L_p^c}|a|^2 \\
\leq\ & e^{-L_{p+1}^c\left(\frac{15}{16}5^{-c}+\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{2}{5}\right)^c\right)}|a|^2 \leq e^{-\frac{9}{8}L_{p+1}^c}|a|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Estimate (9.64) now follows from (9.17).

Estimate on (IV): Estimate (9.34) and its proof yield $\|\varphi + z_p\|_{1,c}$, $\|\varphi + z_{p+1}\|_{1,c} \leq r_{F,b}/2$. Therefore we can apply lemma 18.1 and obtain via (9.60), (9.13) and (9.14)

$$\begin{aligned}
\|IV\|_{1/4,c} \leq\ & D_W\|z_{p+1} - z_p\|_{1/4,c}^2 \leq D_W\left(L_p^{AE_M+1}e^{-L_p^c}|a|^2\right)^2 \leq D_W e^{-L_{p+1}^c\left(\frac{30}{16}5^{-c}\right)}|a|^4 \\
\leq\ & D_W e^{-\frac{7}{4}L_{p+1}^c}(2\rho_1)^2|a|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Estimate (9.65) now follows from (9.15).

□

10 Construction of the set of polynomials $\mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)}$ for $j \geq 1$

In this section we assume $j \geq 1$, that $(\mathcal{IS})_l$ holds for $1 \leq l \leq j$ and that v_{j+1} has been constructed, satisfying $(\mathcal{IS})(1)_{j+1}$. Our goal is to construct inverse matrices $G_C^{(j+1)}(\theta,\lambda)$ of $T_C^{(j+1)}(\theta,\lambda)$ for suitable values of (θ,λ), where $C\in\mathcal{C}^{(j+1)}$ and

$$T^{(j+1)}(\theta,\lambda)=D(\theta,\omega)+DW(\varphi(a)+v_{j+1}(\lambda))\equiv D(\theta,\omega)+R(\lambda). \tag{10.1}$$

Note that $T^{(j+1)}$ as defined by (10.1) is not projected onto some subset of $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$. In particular, the P-projection has not been applied.

Unfortunately, we will not be able to ensure the invertibility of $T_C^{(j+1)}(\theta,\lambda)$ for all relevant parameter values of (θ,λ). Therefore we modify our goal. We construct polynomials p in the variable θ with coefficients depending on λ, such that the zeros of the polynomials coincide with those parameter values of (θ,λ) for which $T_C^{(j+1)}(\theta,\lambda)$ is not invertible. Moreover, away from the zeros of the polynomials we can estimate the norm of the inverse matrices $G_C^{(j+1)}(\theta,\lambda)$ in terms of $|p(\theta,\lambda)|^{-1}$. This statement is made precise in lemma 10.57 below (see also remark 3.30) for a motivation of the polynomials). This section contains the heart of the multi-scale analysis. It follows the ideas introduced by Bourgain in [4], [6], although we have chosen a somewhat different presentation. Before we formulate lemma 10.57, we first state the estimates of lemma 4.54 which are used in this section.

Estimates of lemma 4.54 used in section 10:

$$8e^5\nu D_W D_N D_\tau N_0^{\tau+1}\rho_1\le 1 \tag{10.2}$$

$$8\rho_1\le e\nu D_N \tag{10.3}$$

$$16e\nu D_N\rho_1\le r_{F,b} \tag{10.4}$$

$$2\alpha_1>d_V\delta_1 \tag{10.5}$$

$$\frac{\nu\rho_j N_j}{4}+\frac{\delta_j}{100}\le\nu N_0^{1-E_\rho}, \tag{10.6}$$

$$\frac{(\nu+1)^2\gamma^2}{4\cosh^2(\nu N_0^{1-E_\rho}/2)}-\alpha_1>\frac{d_V\delta_1}{2} \tag{10.7}$$

$$25\nu N_j\rho_j\le\delta_j \tag{10.8}$$

$$2\delta_1<\delta_V \tag{10.9}$$

$$4\rho_1\le\delta_1 \tag{10.10}$$

$$\frac{1}{8}N_1^c(5^c-1)\ge\log 2 \tag{10.11}$$

$$4D_W e^{-\frac{1}{8}N_{l-1}^c}M_l\le 1\quad\text{for } 2\le l\le j \tag{10.12}$$

$$64e\nu D_W D_N^2\rho_1\le d_V\delta_1 \tag{10.13}$$

$$2D_N M_l e^{-\frac{1}{4l(l+1)}N^c_{l-1}} \leq 1 \quad \text{for } 2 \leq l \leq j \tag{10.14}$$

$$M_1 \geq \frac{2}{d_V \delta_1} \tag{10.15}$$

$$8e\nu D_W D_N \rho_1 \leq 1 \tag{10.16}$$

$$2\delta_1 + 2\rho_1 \leq \delta_V \tag{10.17}$$

$$2(\delta_1 + \rho_1) \leq 1 \tag{10.18}$$

$$36B_0! e^6 \nu^2 D_W D_N^2 D_E(B_0) \leq \frac{1}{2} N_0^{E_\rho/2} \tag{10.19}$$

$$e^{2\nu} B_0! D_\psi(B_0) \left(\frac{8}{\rho_{l-1}}\right)^{B_0} \leq e^{\frac{1}{16}N^c_{l-2}} \quad \text{for } l \geq 3 \tag{10.20}$$

$$2D_N e \leq \frac{1}{4} N_0^{E_\rho/2} \tag{10.21}$$

$$\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{16}N^c_l} \leq \frac{1}{4} \tag{10.22}$$

$$D_W \left(\sum_{p=1}^{B_0+1} \frac{1}{p!} p^{B_0} \right) \leq N_0^{E_\rho/2} \tag{10.23}$$

$$1 + \alpha_1 \leq N_0^{E_\rho} \tag{10.24}$$

$$E_\rho \geq 3 \tag{10.25}$$

$$d_V \delta_0 < 2\alpha_1 \tag{10.26}$$

$$4\nu N_1 \rho_1 < \delta_1 \tag{10.27}$$

$$\frac{(\nu+1)^2\gamma^2}{4\cosh^2\delta_1} - \alpha_1 > \frac{d_V \delta_0}{2} \tag{10.28}$$

$$4\delta_1 \leq \frac{s}{(N_1+3)^\tau} \tag{10.29}$$

$$2^\tau \delta_0 < s \tag{10.30}$$

$$\delta_0 < 2\delta_V \tag{10.31}$$

$$\tau \leq E_\delta \tag{10.32}$$

$$N_0^{E_\rho} \leq M_0 \delta_0 \tag{10.33}$$

$$10\rho_l \leq \delta_l \quad \text{for } 2 \leq l \leq j \tag{10.34}$$

$$B_0! \sum_{p=2}^{\infty} D_W \left(\frac{8}{\rho_p}\right)^{B_0} e^{-\frac{1}{16}N^c_{p-1}} \leq 1 \tag{10.35}$$

$$B_0! M_l e^{-\frac{1}{16}N^c_{l-1}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for } 2 \leq l \leq j \tag{10.36}$$

$$E_\delta + 1 \leq q \tag{10.37}$$

$$8e\nu D_V D_W D_N \rho_1^{1/4} \le \frac{1}{2} \tag{10.38}$$

$$2^{B_0} D_V (8e\nu D_W D_N)^2 D_{1,3} \left(\max_{y\ge 0} (1+y)^{3B_0 q} e^{-\frac{1}{4}|y-1|^c} \right) M_0^{2B_0+1} \rho_1 \le \frac{1}{2} \tag{10.39}$$

$$D_{1,5}^4 \rho_1 \le 1 \tag{10.40}$$

$$8e\nu D_W D_N \le N_0 \tag{10.41}$$

$$N_0 \rho_1 \le \delta_1 \tag{10.42}$$

$$D_{1,3} M_0 \max_{y \ge 0} \left[(1+y)^q e^{-\frac{3}{4}|y-1|^c} \right] \le \delta_1^{-1} \tag{10.43}$$

$$B_0 \ge B_1 + B_2 \tag{10.44}$$

$$400\nu\sqrt{\rho_1} < 1 \tag{10.45}$$

$$2\nu(B_1+1) \le B_2 \tag{10.46}$$

$$B_1! 2000 \nu^2 D_1 2^{B_1} M_0^{2(B_0+\nu)} \tilde\rho_j < \left(\frac{\delta_j}{1200\nu} \right)^{2\nu} \tag{10.47}$$

$$(12\nu)^{2\nu(B_1+1)} \le B_2! \tag{10.48}$$

$$16\tilde\rho_j \le \rho_j \tag{10.49}$$

$$2^{2\nu}\delta_1 + 2^{4\nu+1}\rho_1 \le \frac{1}{16\nu} \tag{10.50}$$

$$B_1 \ge 8\nu \tag{10.51}$$

$$\delta_1 \le \frac{1}{4\nu} \tag{10.52}$$

$$(2\nu)! D_N e^2 2 \left(\frac{2(D_V+1)}{d_V} \right)^{2\nu} \delta_1 \le 1 \tag{10.53}$$

$$2000(2\nu+1)\delta_1 \le 1 \tag{10.54}$$

$$\rho_j / \tilde\rho_j \in \mathbb{N} \tag{10.55}$$

$$\tilde\rho_j / \rho_{j+1} \in \mathbb{N} \tag{10.56}$$

We now state the main result of this section

Lemma 10.57 *Let $j \ge 1$. Assume that the induction statements $(\mathcal{IS})_l$, $1 \le l \le j$ and $(\mathcal{IS})(1)_{j+1}$ are satisfied. Let $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(j+1)}$ and $\tilde k \in K^{(j+0.5)}$. Set $k' := \pi_j^{(j+0.5)} \tilde k$ and denote*

$$C' := \begin{cases} C \cap B_{N_{j-1}}(0) & \text{for } j \ge 2, \\ C \cap B_{1.5}(0) & \text{for } j = 1. \end{cases} \tag{10.58}$$

Then $C' \in \mathcal{C}^{(j)}$. For every $\vartheta \in I^{(j)}_{C',k'}$ at least one of the two statements A or B is true.

Statement A : Denote by J the connected component of $U(I^{(j)}_{C',k'}, \delta_j/100)$ which contains ϑ.

There exists an analytic map $(\theta,\lambda)\mapsto G_C^{(j+1)}(\theta,\lambda)$ *defined on* $(\theta,\lambda)\in J\times U(\lambda_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+0.5)},2\tilde{\rho}_j)$ *such that*

$$\left\|G_C^{(j+1)}(\theta,\lambda)\right\|_{\sigma_{j+1},c}\leq 4D_N^2M_j\quad \text{for } (\theta,\lambda)\in J\times U(\lambda_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+0.5)},2\tilde{\rho}_j). \tag{10.59}$$

Moreover, for $(\theta,\lambda)\in J\times U(\lambda_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+0.5)},2\tilde{\rho}_j)\setminus\tilde{Z}_C$ *the matrix* $G_C^{(j+1)}(\theta,\lambda)$ *is the inverse of* $T_C^{(j+1)}(\theta,\lambda)$.

Statement B : *There exists a polynomial* $p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta}$ *with the following properties. There exist an integer* $1\leq d\leq 2\nu$ *and analytic functions* $b_0,\ldots,b_{d-1}$*, such that for all* $(\theta,\lambda)\in U(\vartheta,\delta_j/400)\times U(\lambda_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+0.5)},2\tilde{\rho}_j)$ *the following holds.*

(a) $p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta}(\theta,\lambda)=\theta^d+\sum_{i<d}b_i(\lambda)\theta^i$.

(b) $\left\|G_C^{(j+1)}(\theta,\lambda)\right\|_{\sigma_{j+1},c}\leq 4D_N^2M_j\left(1+2\frac{4D_N^2M_j}{|p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta}(\theta-\vartheta,\lambda)|\delta_1}\right)$ *if* $p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta}(\theta-\vartheta,\lambda)\neq 0$.

(c) $|b_i(\lambda)|\leq\frac{1}{2d}$.

(d) $|\partial^\beta b_i(\lambda)|\leq D_2\left(M_0^{2B_0+2\nu}\right)^{2|\beta|_1-1}$ *for* $1\leq|\beta|_1\leq B_1$.

(e) $b_i(\lambda)\in\mathbb{R}$ *for* $\lambda\in B(\lambda_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+0.5)},2\tilde{\rho}_j)$ *and* $0\leq i\leq d-1$.

(f) $\left|\partial_\theta p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta}(\theta,\lambda)\right|\leq 1$ *for* $|\theta|\leq\delta_1/2$.

The proof of lemma 10.57 stretches over the next three subsections. In subsection 10.1 we construct a function $f_{C,k'}$ defined for $(\theta,\lambda)\in U(\tilde{I}_{C',k'}^{(j)},\delta_j/100)\times U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda_{k'}^{(j)}),\rho_j/4)$, such that the zeros of f coincide with those values of (θ,λ) where $T_C^{(j+1)}(\theta,\lambda)$ is not invertible. In principle, one could define $f_{C,k'}=\det(T_C^{(j+1)})$. However, we will need estimates on $f_{C,k'}$ and its derivatives which we cannot prove for the determinant of a matrix of such large dimensions. Therefore we define $f_{C,k'}$ to be the determinant of some reduced matrix b which is at most of size $2\nu\times 2\nu$. In subsection 10.2 we prove certain estimates for the function $f_{C,k'}$ which are sufficient to prove lemma 10.57 by applying the Weierstrass preparation theorem (see subsection 10.3). In the final subsection 10.4 we define sets of polynomials which will be important for the completion of the induction step in section 11.

10.1 Construction of the function $f_{C,k'}$

Throughout section 10.1 we suppose that $j\geq 1$ and that induction statements $(\mathcal{IS})_l$, $1\leq l\leq j$, $(\mathcal{IS})(1)_{j+1}$ are satisfied. We fix $k'\in K^{(j)}$, $C\in\mathcal{C}^{(j+1)}$ and let C' be defined as in (10.58).

10.1.1 Definition of the singular set S

It follows from induction statement $\mathcal{IS}(3a)_{2\le l\le j}$ that $\tilde{I}^{(j)}_{C',k'} \subset \tilde{I}^{(1)}_{\tilde{C},1}$ for some $\tilde{C} \in \mathcal{C}^{(1)}$. Induction statement $\mathcal{IS}(3a)_{j=1}$ then implies that for all $\theta \in U(\tilde{I}^{(j)}_{C',k'}, \delta_j/100)$ precisely one of the following $2\nu+1$ cases occurs.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Case } I\text{:} \qquad & \operatorname{dist}(\theta, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) < \frac{101}{100}\delta_1, \\ \text{Case } II_i\text{:} \qquad & \operatorname{dist}(\theta, \{2\omega_i^{(0)}\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) < \frac{101}{100}\delta_1, \;\; 1 \le i \le \nu, \\ \text{Case } III_i\text{:} \qquad & \operatorname{dist}(\theta, \{-2\omega_i^{(0)}\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) < \frac{101}{100}\delta_1, \;\; 1 \le i \le \nu. \end{aligned} \tag{10.60}$$

We now define the singular set S, depending on the above cases:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{In Case } I \text{ we set} \qquad & S := C \cap \mathcal{S}, \\ \text{In Case } II_i \text{ we set} \qquad & S := C \cap \{-e_i\}, \\ \text{In Case } III_i \text{ we set} \qquad & S := C \cap \{e_i\}. \end{aligned} \tag{10.61}$$

Remark 10.62 *The definition of the set S depends on θ which is omitted in our notation. As the definition of S is made in such a way that the diagonal entries of the linearized operator $T^{(j+1)}(\theta,\lambda)(m,m)$ have small modulus for $m \in S$. More precisely, we can show*

$$|V(\theta,\omega)(m)| \le 2D_V\delta_1 \quad \textit{for } m \in S. \tag{10.63}$$

Consider first case I. Let $m = \mu e_i \in S$, $\mu \in \{\pm 1\}$. By (4.12), (3.31) $V(\theta,\omega)(m) = V_i(\theta + \mu\omega_i)$. Since $|\omega_i - \omega_i^{(0)}| < 2\rho_1$ we learn from (10.10) that

$$\mathit{dist}(\theta + \mu\omega_i, \{\mu\omega_i^{(0)}\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) < 2\delta_1.$$

Then (10.9) and proposition 19.1 imply (10.63). Assume now that we are in case II_i and $S \neq \emptyset$. Then $V(\theta,\omega)(-e_i) = V_i(\theta - \omega_i)$. As above we conclude

$$\mathit{dist}(\theta - \omega_i, \{\omega_i^{(0)}\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) < 2\delta_1,$$

leading again to the estimate (10.63). Case III_i is similar to case II_i.

We set

$$\Gamma := C \setminus S. \tag{10.64}$$

Remark 10.65 *In order to see that the matrix* $T^{(j+1)}(\theta,\lambda)$ *is well defined up to possible singularities on the diagonal we use*

$$\|\varphi(a)+v_{j+1}(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \le 8e\nu D_N\rho_1 \le \frac{r_{F,b}}{2} \quad \textit{for } \lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(1)},\rho_1). \tag{10.66}$$

The proof of estimate (10.66) is similar to the proof of (9.34) and relies on the induction statement $\mathcal{IS}(1)_l$ *for* $1 \le l \le j+1$ *and on (10.11), (10.2), (10.3), (10.4).*

10.1.2 Decomposition of the nonsingular set Γ

In addition to the assumptions and notation stated in the beginning of section 10.1 we will assume throughout the present subsection 10.1.2 that $(\theta,\lambda) \in U(\tilde{I}^{(j)}_{C',k'},\delta_j/100) \times U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda^{(j)}_{k'}),\rho_j/4)$ is arbitrary but fixed. For $1 \le l \le j$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} k_l &:= \pi^{(j)}_l k', & (10.67)\\ C_l(n) &:= \begin{cases} (C-\{n\}) \cap B_{N_{l-1}}(0) & \text{for } 2 \le l \le j,\\ (C-\{n\}) \cap B_{1.5}(0) & \text{for } l = 1. \end{cases} & (10.68) \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$E_0 := \{m \in \Gamma : |<m,g>| \in \{1,2,\ldots,\nu\}\}. \tag{10.69}$$

For each $m \in E_0$ we denote by $m' \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ the (uniquely defined) lattice point satisfying $<m',g>=0$ and $m-m' \in \mathcal{S}$. Observe that for every $m \in E_0$, $1 \le l \le j$ we have $C_l(m') \in \mathcal{C}^{(l)}$, since $C_l(m')$ is an interval (being an intersection of intervals) and $m-m' \in C_l(m')$ guarantees that $C_l(m') \cap \mathcal{S}$ is not the empty set. Next we define subsets of Γ:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_l &:= \left\{ m \in E_0 : |m'| > 2N_{l-1} \text{ and } \theta + <\omega,m'> \in U\left(\tilde{I}^{(l-1)}_{C_{l-1}(m'),k_{l-1}} \setminus \tilde{I}^{(l)}_{C_l(m'),k_l}, \frac{\delta_l}{20}\right)\right\}\\ &\qquad \text{for } 2 \le l \le j, & (10.70)\\ \Gamma_1 &:= \Gamma \setminus \left(\bigcup_{l=2}^{j} \Gamma_l\right). & (10.71) \end{aligned}$$

The remainder of this subsection is devoted to proving the following properties for the sets Γ_l.

(α) For all $m \in \Gamma_1$: $|V(\theta,\omega)(m)| > \frac{d_V\delta_1}{2}$.

(β) $\Gamma_l \subset \{m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu : |m| \ge 2N_{l-1}\}$ for $2 \le l \le j$.

(γ) For $2 \leq l \leq j$ and $m \in \Gamma_l$ we have

$$\left\| \left(T^{(j+1)}|_{C_l(m')+\{m'\}} \right)^{-1} (\theta, \lambda) \right\|_{\sigma_l, c} \leq 2 D_N M_l. \tag{10.72}$$

For an interpretation of statement (γ) in the case $(\theta, \lambda) \in \tilde{Z}_{C_l(m')+\{m'\}}$ we refer the reader to remark 9.43.

Proof of (α): Let $m \in \Gamma_1$.

Case 1: $m \in \Gamma_1 \setminus E_0$. Suppose first that $< m, g >= 0$. Then $V(\theta, \omega)(m) = \alpha_1$ and the claim follows from (10.5). Therefore we may assume that $| < m, g > | \geq \nu + 1$. Since the imaginary part of $\theta + < \omega, m >$ is bounded by $\frac{\nu \rho_j N_j}{4} + \frac{\delta_j}{100} \leq \nu N_0^{1-E_\rho}$ (see (10.6)) the claim follows from (10.7).

Case 2: $m \in E_0 \cap \Gamma_1$ and $m' \neq 0$.

Recall that the definition of $\mathcal{C}^{(j+1)}$ (see (4.50)) implies $\Gamma \subset C \subset B_{N_j}(0)$. Furthermore, we have assumed that $m' \neq 0$. Since $|m - m'| = 1$ we obtain

$$0 < |m'| \leq N_j. \tag{10.73}$$

Thus we can define $l \in \{1, ..., j\}$ to be the minimal integer such that $|m'| \leq 2N_l$ is satisfied. Recall that

$$\theta = \theta + < \omega, 0 > \in U(\tilde{I}^{(j)}_{C_j(0), k'}, \delta_j/100) \subset U(\tilde{I}^{(l)}_{C_l(0), k_l}, \delta_l/10). \tag{10.74}$$

Applying induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})(3d)_l$ it follows that

$$\theta + < \omega, m' > \in \mathbb{C} \setminus U(\tilde{I}^{(l)}_{C_l(m'), k_l}, \delta_l/10). \tag{10.75}$$

Note that (10.8) implies

$$| \operatorname{Im}(\theta + < \omega, m' >)| < \frac{\delta_j}{100} + \frac{\nu N_j \rho_j}{4} \leq \frac{\delta_j}{50}. \tag{10.76}$$

Let $\theta' \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $|\theta + < \omega, m' > - \theta'| \leq \delta_j/50$. In view of (10.75) it is clear that $\theta' \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{I}^{(l)}_{C_l(m'), k_l}$. Using

$$\tilde{I}^{(s)}_{C_s(m'), k_s} \subset \tilde{I}^{(s-1)}_{C_{s-1}(m'), k_{s-1}} \quad \text{for } 2 \leq s \leq j. \tag{10.77}$$

we obtain that

$$\mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{I}^{(l)}_{C_l(m'), k_l} = \mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{I}^{(1)}_{C_1(m'), k_1} \cup \bigcup_{s=2}^{l} \left(\tilde{I}^{(s-1)}_{C_{s-1}(m'), k_{s-1}} \setminus \tilde{I}^{(s)}_{C_s(m'), k_s} \right) \tag{10.78}$$

Since the definition of Γ_1 (10.71) implies that $m \notin \Gamma_s$ for $2 \leq s \leq j$, it follows from (10.70) that

$$\theta' \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{I}^{(1)}_{C_1(m'),k_1} \tag{10.79}$$

and consequently

$$\theta + < \omega, m' > \in U\left(\mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{I}^{(1)}_{C_1(m'),k_1}, \frac{\delta_j}{50}\right). \tag{10.80}$$

Since $\delta_j \leq \delta_1$ induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})(4)_1$ ($k \equiv k_1$, $C \equiv C_1(m')$) implies

$$|V(\theta + < \omega, m' >, \omega)(m - m')| > \frac{d_V \delta_1}{2}. \tag{10.81}$$

Since $< m', g >= 0$ we have $d_V\delta_1/2 < |V(\theta + < \omega, m' >, \omega)(m - m')| = |V(\theta, \omega)(m)|$.

Case 3: $m \in E_0 \cap \Gamma_1$ *and* $m' = 0$.

Since $m - m' \in \mathcal{S}$ and $m \in C$ we have $m \in \mathcal{S} \cap C$. Write $m = \mu e_i$, where $\mu \in \{\pm 1\}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$. We will show by contradiction that

$$|V(\theta, \omega)(m)| = |V_i(\mu\omega_i + \theta)| > \frac{d_V \delta_1}{2}. \tag{10.82}$$

Assume $|V_i(\mu\omega_i + \theta)| \leq d_V\delta_1/2$. Proposition 19.1 (a) together with (10.9) imply that either (10.83) or (10.84) below must hold.

$$\operatorname{dist}(\mu\omega_i + \theta, \{\mu\omega_i^{(0)}\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) \leq \frac{\delta_1}{2}. \tag{10.83}$$

$$\operatorname{dist}(\mu\omega_i + \theta, \{-\mu\omega_i^{(0)}\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) \leq \frac{\delta_1}{2}. \tag{10.84}$$

Using furthermore that $|\omega_i - \omega_i^{(0)}| < 2\rho_1 \leq \delta_1/2$ (see (10.10)) we learn that either (10.85) or (10.86) below is true.

$$\operatorname{dist}(\theta, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) \leq \delta_1. \tag{10.85}$$

$$\operatorname{dist}(\theta, \{-2\mu\omega_i^{(0)}\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) \leq \delta_1. \tag{10.86}$$

Suppose (10.85) holds, then we are in Case I (cf. (10.60)) and by (10.61) we have $\mathcal{S} \cap C = S$. Since $m \in \mathcal{S} \cap C$ (see beginning of proof of case 3) this contradicts $m \in \Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma \equiv C \setminus S$. On the other hand, assuming the validity of (10.86), we have Case II_i if $\mu = -1$ and Case III_i if $\mu = 1$. In either of these cases we learn from the definition (10.61) that $m \in S$, contradicting the assumption $m \in \Gamma_1$. Hence we have arrived at a contradiction and (10.82) holds, completing the proof of (α).

Proof of (β): Obvious from (10.70) and $|m - m'| = 1$.

Proof of (γ): Let $m \in \Gamma_l$ for $2 \leq l \leq j$. Recall that $C_l(m') \in \mathcal{C}^{(l)}$. Furthermore

$$(\theta + < \omega, m' >, \lambda) \in U\left(\tilde{I}^{(l-1)}_{C_{l-1}(m'),k_{l-1}} \setminus \tilde{I}^{(l)}_{C_l(m'),k_l}, \frac{\delta_l}{10}\right) \times U\left(B_{\rho_l}(\lambda^{(l)}_{k_l}), \rho_l\right). \tag{10.87}$$

The induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})(4)_l$ then implies the existence of $G^{(l)}_{C_l(m')}(\theta + < \omega, m' >, \lambda)$ which is the inverse of the matrix $T^{(l)}_{C_l(m')}(\theta + < \omega, m' >, \lambda)$ if $(\theta + < \omega, m' >, \lambda) \notin \tilde{Z}_{C_l(m')}$. Using proposition 19.18 and $< m', g >= 0$ we obtain

$$\left\| \left(G^{(l)}_{C_l(m') + \{m'\}} \right)(\theta, \lambda) \right\|_{\sigma_l, c} \leq M_l. \tag{10.88}$$

In view of proposition 24.11 claim (γ) follows, if we can show that

$$\left\| \left(T^{(j+1)}(\theta, \lambda) - T^{(l)}(\theta, \lambda) \right) |_{C_l(m') + \{m'\}} \right\|_{\sigma_l, c} \leq \frac{1}{2M_l}. \tag{10.89}$$

Estimate (10.89) is a consequence of (10.66), lemma 18.1, induction statements $(\mathcal{IS})(1d)_s$ for $l < s \leq j+1$, (10.11) and (10.12):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \left(T^{(j+1)}(\theta, \lambda) - T^{(l)}(\theta, \lambda) \right) |_{C_l(m') + \{m'\}} \right\|_{\sigma_l, c} \\
\leq\ & \|DW(\varphi(a) + v_{j+1}(\lambda)) - DW(\varphi(a) + v_l(\lambda))\|_{1,c} \\
\leq\ & D_W \|v_{j+1}(\lambda) - v_l(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \\
\leq\ & D_W \sum_{s=l+1}^{j+1} \|v_s(\lambda) - v_{s-1}(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \\
\leq\ & D_W \sum_{s \geq l+1} e^{-\frac{1}{8} N^c_{s-2}} \\
\leq\ & 2 D_W e^{-\frac{1}{8} N^c_{l-1}} \leq \frac{1}{2M_l}.
\end{aligned}$$

10.1.3 Construction of $G^{(j+1)}_\Gamma(\theta, \lambda)$

Proposition 10.90 *There exists an analytic map* $(\theta, \lambda) \mapsto G^{(j+1)}_\Gamma(\theta, \lambda)$ *which is defined for* $(\theta, \lambda) \in U(\tilde{I}^{(j)}_{C',k'}, \delta_j/100) \times U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda^{(j)}_{k'}), \rho_j/4)$ *such that*

$$\left\| G^{(j+1)}_\Gamma(\theta, \lambda) \right\|_{\sigma_{j+1}, c} \leq 4 D_N^2 M_j \quad \text{for } (\theta, \lambda) \in U(\tilde{I}^{(j)}_{C',k'}, \delta_j/100) \times U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda^{(j)}_{k'}), \rho_j/4). \tag{10.91}$$

Moreover, for $(\theta, \lambda) \in U(\tilde{I}^{(j)}_{C',k'}, \delta_j/100) \times U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda^{(j)}_{k'}), \rho_j/4) \setminus \tilde{Z}_\Gamma$ *the matrix* $G^{(j+1)}_\Gamma(\theta, \lambda)$ *is the inverse of* $T^{(j+1)}_\Gamma(\theta, \lambda)$.

Remark 10.92 *Recall from remark 10.62 that the set S and hence Γ depend on the variable θ, casting some doubt on the analyticity of $G_{\Gamma}^{(j+1)}$. However, it follows from the definition of the different cases (10.60) and from induction statements $(\mathcal{IS})(3a)_{1\leq l\leq j}$ that Γ is constant on connected components of $U(\tilde{I}^{(j)}_{C',k'}, \delta_j/100)$ resolving the issue.*

Proof. In order to prove proposition 10.90 we apply the coupling lemma 20.1. Assume first that $(\theta, \lambda) \notin \tilde{Z}_{\Gamma}$. In the notation of lemma 20.1

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda &\equiv \Gamma, \\
T &\equiv T^{(j+1)}(\theta,\lambda) = D + R, \text{ where by (10.1)} \\
D(m,n) &= V(\theta,\omega)(m)\delta_{m,n}, \\
R(m,n) &= DW(\varphi(a) + v_{j+1}(\lambda))(m,n), \\
\sigma &\equiv 1, \\
\tilde{\sigma} &\equiv \sigma_{j+1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{10.93}$$

Next we define the quantities l_n, μ_n, C_n and U_n for each $n \in \Gamma$. By definition (10.71) we have $\Gamma = \bigcup_{s=1}^{j} \Gamma_s$. Therefore we can pick for every $n \in \Gamma$ a (not necessarily unique) integer $s_n \in \{1, \ldots, j\}$ such that $n \in \Gamma_{s_n}$. In the case $s_n = 1$ we set

$$l_n := 1, \quad \mu_n := 0, \quad C_n := \tfrac{4D_N}{d_V \delta_1}, \quad U(n) := \{n\}. \tag{10.94}$$

If $2 \leq s_n \leq j$ it follows from definition (10.70) that $n \in E_0$ and therefore there exists an unique $n' \in \mathbb{Z}^{\nu}$ satisfying $< n', g >= 0$ and $n - n' \in \mathcal{S}$. We set

$$l_n := N_{s_n - 1} - 1, \quad \mu_n := \sigma_{s_n} - \sigma_{j+1}, \quad C_n := 2D_N M_{s_n}, \quad U(n) := C_{s_n}(n') + \{n'\}. \tag{10.95}$$

From (10.66) and lemma 18.1 we obtain

$$\|R\|_{1,c} \leq 8e\nu D_W D_N \rho_1. \tag{10.96}$$

Next we verify conditions (20.3) – (20.5) of lemma 20.1.

Case $s_n = 1$: The set $U(n)$ contains the single point n and

$$|D(n,n) + R(n,n)| \geq \frac{d_V \delta_1}{2} - \|R\|_{1,c} \geq \frac{d_V \delta_1}{4}$$

by statement (α) in section 10.1.2, (10.13) and (10.96). Hence (20.3) is satisfied. Condition (20.4) is obvious and condition (20.5) follows again from (10.13) and (10.96).

Case $2 \leq s_n \leq j$: Condition (20.3) is satisfied by statement (γ) in section 10.1.2 and (20.4) follows from the definition of $C_{s_n}(n')$ (cf. (10.68)) and $|n - n'| = 1$. Note in particular that by definition (10.70) we have $|n'| > 2N_{s_n - 1}$ which guarantees that $C_{s_n}(n') + \{n'\}$ is not only a subset of C but also a subset of Γ. Finally, condition (20.5) is satisfied by (10.96), (10.16) and (10.14) (see also (4.7)). Hence lemma 20.1 can be applied and we obtain

$$\left\| \left(T_\Gamma^{(j+1)} \right)^{-1} (\theta, \lambda) \right\|_{\sigma_{j+1}, c} \leq 2D_N \max \left(\frac{4D_N}{d_V \delta_1}, 2D_N M_j \right)$$

for $(\theta, \lambda) \in U(\tilde{I}^{(j)}_{C',k'}, \delta_j/100) \times U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda^{(j)}_{k'}), \rho_j/4) \setminus \tilde{Z}_\Gamma$. Keeping (10.15) in mind we obtain (10.91). It remains to extend the inverse of $T_\Gamma^{(j+1)}$ across the set $\tilde{Z}_\Gamma$ to a function $G_\Gamma^{(j+1)}$ and to prove the analyticity of $G_\Gamma^{(j+1)}$. The argument, however, is very similar to the one given in the proof of lemma 9.18 (see below (9.57)) and we do not repeat it here. □

10.1.4 Definition of $f_{C,k'}$

Consider the following block decomposition of the matrix $T_C^{(j+1)}$,

$$T_C^{(j+1)}(\theta, \lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} T_\Gamma & P_1 \\ P_2 & T_S \end{pmatrix}. \tag{10.97}$$

In the case $S \neq \emptyset$ we set

$$b := T_S - P_2 G_\Gamma P_1. \tag{10.98}$$

Remark 10.99 *Remark 10.62 shows in particular that* $T_S^{(j+1)}(\theta, \lambda)$ *has no singularities on the diagonal. Since* R *and* $G_\Gamma^{(j+1)}$ *are analytic functions (see proposition 10.90) it follows that (10.98) defines an analytic function* b *on* $U(\tilde{I}^{(j)}_{C',k'}, \delta_j/100) \times U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda^{(j)}_{k'}), \rho_j/4)$.

We define

$$f_{C,k'}(\theta, \lambda) := \begin{cases} \det b(\theta, \lambda) & \text{if } S \neq \emptyset, \\ 1 & \text{if } S = \emptyset, \end{cases} \tag{10.100}$$

for $(\theta, \lambda) \in U(\tilde{I}^{(j)}_{C',k'}, \delta_j/100) \times U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda^{(j)}_{k'}), \rho_j/4)$. Note that T_C is invertible if b is invertible. Indeed, in case b^{-1} exists, set

$$G_C^{(j+1)} := \begin{pmatrix} G_\Gamma + G_\Gamma P_1 b^{-1} P_2 G_\Gamma & -G_\Gamma P_1 b^{-1} \\ -b^{-1} P_2 G_\Gamma & b^{-1} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{10.101}$$

Then $G_C^{(j+1)}$ is an analytic function on $U(\tilde{I}^{(j)}_{C',k'}, \delta_j/100) \times U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda^{(j)}_{k'}), \rho_j/4)$ and

$$G_C^{(j+1)}(\theta,\lambda) = \left(T_C^{(j+1)}\right)^{-1}(\theta,\lambda) \ \text{ for } \ (\theta,\lambda) \notin \tilde{Z}_C.$$

In particular, $T_C(\theta,\lambda)$ is invertible except at the zeros of $f_{C,k'}$.

10.2 Estimates on f

Before we state the result of this section we define a real number $\theta_\iota = \theta_\iota(\theta)$ depending on the cases defined in (10.60).

$$\theta_\iota := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{in case } \ I, \\ \left[2\omega_i^{(0)}\right] & \text{in case } \ II_i, \\ \left[-2\omega_i^{(0)}\right] & \text{in case } \ III_i. \end{cases} \tag{10.102}$$

Lemma 10.103 *Let $j \geq 1$. Suppose that the induction statements $(\mathcal{IS})_l$, $1 \leq l \leq j$ and $(\mathcal{IS})(1)_{j+1}$ are satisfied. For $\theta \in U(\tilde{I}^{(j)}_{C',k'}, \delta_j/100)$ we set*

$$d \equiv d(\theta) := \#S(\theta). \tag{10.104}$$

Then we can express

$$f_{C,k'}(\theta,\lambda) = \tilde{f}(\theta,\lambda) \cdot \left(q(\theta,\lambda) + r(\theta,\lambda)\right), \tag{10.105}$$

for $(\theta,\lambda) \in U(\tilde{I}^{(j)}_{C',k'}, \delta_j/100) \times U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda^{(j)}_{k'}), \rho_j/8)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{f}(\theta,\lambda)| &\geq d_V^{2\nu} && (10.106) \\ q(\theta,\lambda) &= ([\theta]-\theta_\iota)^d + \sum_{l<d} \tilde{a}_l(\lambda)([\theta]-\theta_\iota)^l, && (10.107) \\ |\tilde{a}_l(\lambda)| &\leq 2^{2\nu+1}\rho_1 \quad \text{for } 0 \leq l < d, && (10.108) \\ \left|\partial^\beta \tilde{a}_l(\lambda)\right| &\leq 3^{3\nu} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq l < d, \ |\beta|_1 \geq 1, && (10.109) \\ \left|\partial_\theta^\beta r(\theta,\lambda)\right| &\leq \sqrt{\rho_1}, \quad \text{for } \ 0 \leq \beta \leq B_0, && (10.110) \\ \left|\partial^\beta r(\theta,\lambda)\right| &\leq D_1 M_0^{2|\beta|_1+2\nu} \quad \text{for } \ 1 \leq \beta \leq B_0. && (10.111) \end{aligned}$$

The functions $\tilde{f}$, r and a_l are analytic functions in their respective domain of definition. Furthermore, $\tilde{a}_l(\lambda)$, $r(\theta,\lambda)$ are real if all the components of the vector (θ,λ) are real.

Remark 10.112 *Recall from remark 10.92 that* $d(\theta)$ *is constant on connected components of* $U(\tilde{I}^{(j)}_{C',k'}, \delta_j/100)$*. In the case that* $d(\theta) = 0$*, the statement of lemma 10.103 is trivially satisfied with* $\tilde{f} \equiv 1$*,* $q \equiv 1$ *and* $r \equiv 0$*. Therefore we will assume throughout the remainder of section 10.2 that* $S \neq \emptyset$*.*

10.2.1 Definition of $\tilde{f}$, q and r

First we define the decomposition

$$D_S = \tilde{D}\Lambda. \tag{10.113}$$

Case I: Let $\mu \in \{\pm 1\}$, $i \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ and $\mu e_i \in S$. By proposition 19.1 (b) and (10.17)

$$D(\theta, \omega)(\mu e_i) = V_i(\theta + \mu\omega_i) = \tilde{V}_{i,\mu}([\theta] + \mu\omega_i)([\theta] + \mu(\omega_i - \omega_i^{(0)})). \tag{10.114}$$

On S we define the following diagonal matrices

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{D}(\theta, \lambda) &:= \ \mathrm{diag}\left(\tilde{V}_{i,\mu}([\theta] + \mu\omega_i)\right), & (10.115)\\ \Lambda(\theta, \lambda) &:= \ \mathrm{diag}\left([\theta] + \mu(\omega_i - \omega_i^{(0)})\right), & (10.116) \end{aligned}$$

which clearly satisfy (10.113).

Case II$_i$: Recall that $S = \{-e_i\}$ since we assumed $S \neq \emptyset$. It follows again from proposition 19.1 (b), (10.17) that (10.113) holds with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{D}(\theta, \lambda)(-e_i, -e_i) &:= \tilde{V}_{i,+}([\theta - \omega_i]), & (10.117)\\ \Lambda(\theta, \lambda)(-e_i, -e_i) &:= ([\theta] - \theta_\iota) - (\omega_i - \omega_i^{(0)}). & (10.118) \end{aligned}$$

Case III$_i$: Now $S = \{e_i\}$. From proposition 19.1 (b) and (10.17) we again obtain (10.113) with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{D}(\theta, \lambda)(e_i, e_i) &:= \tilde{V}_{i,-}([\theta + \omega_i]), & (10.119)\\ \Lambda(\theta, \lambda)(e_i, e_i) &:= ([\theta] - \theta_\iota) + (\omega_i - \omega_i^{(0)}). & (10.120) \end{aligned}$$

We express the matrix b defined in (10.98) in the following way.

$$\begin{aligned} b &= D_S + R_S - P_2 G_\Gamma P_1 = \tilde{D}\left(\Lambda + \tilde{D}^{-1}(R_S - P_2 G_\Gamma P_1)\right) & \\ &= \tilde{D}(\Lambda + \tilde{R}), \quad \text{with} & (10.121)\\ \tilde{R} &:= \tilde{D}^{-1}(R_S - P_2 G_\Gamma P_1). & (10.122) \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that the following definitions yield relation (10.105).

$$\tilde{f} := \det \tilde{D}, \tag{10.123}$$

$$q := \det \Lambda, \tag{10.124}$$

$$r := \det(\Lambda + \tilde{R}) - \det \Lambda. \tag{10.125}$$

The following estimates are consequences of the above definitions, (10.18) and proposition 19.1 (b). For $m \in S$

$$\left|\partial^\beta \Lambda(\theta, \lambda)(m,m)\right| \leq 1 \quad \text{for } |\beta|_1 \geq 0, \tag{10.126}$$

$$\left|\partial^\beta \tilde{D}^{-1}(\theta, \lambda)(m,m)\right| \leq D_V \quad \text{for } 0 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq B_0. \tag{10.127}$$

10.2.2 Proof of properties (10.106) – (10.109) for $\tilde{f}$ and q

Estimate (10.106) follows from (19.4), (10.123), the definition of $\tilde{D}$ and the fact that $1 \leq d \leq 2\nu$. It is clear from the definition that the function q can be written in form (10.107). Moreover, it is elementary to verify estimates (10.108), (10.109) for the coefficients $\tilde{a}_l(\lambda)$ from $|\omega - \omega^{(0)}| < 2\rho_1 \leq 1$ (see (10.18)) and using the Leibniz rule. The analyticity of $\tilde{f}$, q and r as well as the realness of $\tilde{a}_l$ and r follow immediately from $(\mathcal{IS})(1b)_{j+1}$ and $(\mathcal{IS})(1g)_{j+1}$. To complete the proof of lemma 10.103 we still need to verify (10.110) and (10.111) which will be done in section 10.2.6.

10.2.3 Estimates on R

Proposition 10.128 *Let $j \geq 1$. Suppose that the induction statements $(\mathcal{IS})_l$, $1 \leq l \leq j$ and $(\mathcal{IS})(1)_{j+1}$ are satisfied. For $1 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq B_0$ and $\lambda \in U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda_{k'}^{(j)}), \rho_j/4)$ we obtain*

$$\|R(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \leq 8e\nu D_W D_N \rho_1 \leq \frac{d_V \delta_1}{4} \leq 1, \tag{10.129}$$

$$\|\partial^\beta R(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \leq N_0^{E_\rho |\beta|_1}. \tag{10.130}$$

Proof. Estimate (10.129) follows from lemma 18.1, (10.66), and (10.13). Assume now $1 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq B_0$. Recall that the matrix $R(\lambda)$ is given by

$$R(\lambda)(m,n) = \sum_{p \geq 2} p\alpha_p \left(\varphi(a) + v_{j+1}(\lambda)\right)^{*(p-1)}(m-n) \tag{10.131}$$

(see (10.1), (18.4)). Using corollary 24.8 we obtain the following formula for the derivatives of R:

$$(\partial^\beta R)y = \sum_{p=1}^{|\beta|_1} \sum_{\substack{\beta_1+\ldots+\beta_p=\beta \\ \beta_i \neq 0 \text{ for } 1\leq i\leq p}} \frac{1}{p!}\frac{\beta!}{\beta_1!\cdots\beta_p!} D^{p+1}W(\varphi+v_{j+1})[\partial^{\beta_1}(\varphi+v_{j+1}),\ldots,\partial^{\beta_p}(\varphi+v_{j+1}),y]. \tag{10.132}$$

It follows from the definition of φ (3.9), from the induction statements $(\mathcal{IS})(1e)_{2\leq l\leq j+1}$ and from (10.19) – (10.22) that for $1\leq|\beta|_1\leq B_0$, $\lambda\in U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda_{k'}^{(j)}),\rho_j/4)$

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial^\beta(\varphi(a)+v_{j+1}(\lambda))\|_{1,c} &\leq \|\partial^\beta\varphi(a)\|_{1,c}+\sum_{l=2}^{j+1}\|\partial^\beta(v_l-v_{l-1})(\lambda)\|_{1,c}\\ &\leq 2D_Ne+\frac{1}{2}N_0^{E_\rho(|\beta|_1-0.5)}+\sum_{l=3}^{j+1}e^{-\frac{1}{16}N_{l-2}^c}\\ &\leq N_0^{E_\rho(|\beta|_1-0.5)}. \end{aligned} \tag{10.133}$$

Estimate (10.130) is then a consequence of (10.19), lemma 18.1, proposition 24.5 and (10.23). □

10.2.4 Estimates on G_Γ

Recall the definitions of $D_{1,3}$ and q in (4.29) and (4.18).

Lemma 10.134 *Let $j\geq 1$. Suppose that the induction statements $(\mathcal{IS})_l$, $1\leq l\leq j$ and $(\mathcal{IS})(1)_{j+1}$ are satisfied. Recall the definition of $G_\Gamma^{(j+1)}$ in proposition 10.90 For all $0\leq|\beta|_1\leq B_0$, $(\theta,\lambda)\in U(\tilde{I}_{C',k'}^{(j)},\delta_j/100)\times U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda_{k'}^{(j)}),\rho_j/8)$ and m, $n\in\Gamma$ we have*

$$\left|\partial^\beta G_\Gamma^{(j+1)}(\theta,\lambda)(m,n)\right| w_{1/4,c}(m-n)\leq D_{1,3}M_0^{2|\beta|_1+1}(1+|n|)^{q(2|\beta|_1+1)}. \tag{10.135}$$

Recall from section 10.1.3 that G_Γ was constructed via the coupling lemma 20.1 from the collection of local inverse matrices $G_{U(n)}^{(j+1)}$, $n\in\Gamma$. Before we prove lemma 10.134 we first provide estimates on the derivatives of the matrices $G_{U(n)}\equiv G_{U(n)}^{(j+1)}$.

Proposition 10.136 *Suppose that the assumptions of lemma 10.134 hold. Let $n\in\Gamma_1$ (cf. (10.71)). Then*

$$\|\partial^\beta G_{U(n)}\|_{1,c}\leq D_{1,1}M_0^{|\beta|_1+1}(1+|n|)^{(E_\delta+1)(|\beta|_1+1)} \tag{10.137}$$

for $(\theta,\lambda)\in U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda_{k'}^{(j)}),\rho_j/8)$, $0\leq|\beta|_1\leq B_0$ (cf. (4.27)).

Proof. (Proposition 10.136).

Recall that for $n \in \Gamma_1$ we have defined $U(n) = \{n\}$. The entry of the corresponding matrix $T_{U(n)}$ can be written in the form

$$G_{U(n)}(n,n) = (T_{U(n)})^{-1}(n,n) = \frac{f_n}{g_n}, \tag{10.138}$$

where

$$f_n(\theta,\lambda) \quad := \quad \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } <n,g>=0, \\ 4\sin^2\frac{<\omega,n>+\theta}{2} & \text{if } <n,g>\neq 0, \end{cases} \tag{10.139}$$

$$g_n(\theta,\lambda) \quad := \quad \begin{cases} \alpha_1 + R(\lambda)(n,n) & \text{if } <n,g>=0, \\ (\alpha_1 + R(\lambda)(n,n))4\sin^2\frac{<\omega,n>+\theta}{2} - <n,g>^2\gamma^2 & \text{if } <n,g>\neq 0. \end{cases} \tag{10.140}$$

Estimates on f_n: Using $2\sin^2 x = 1-\cos(2x)$ it is easy to verify that

$$\left|\partial^\beta f_n(\theta,\lambda)\right| \leq 4(1+|n|)^{|\beta|_1} \tag{10.141}$$

for all multi-indices β.

Estimates on derivatives of g_n: We will show that for $1 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq B_0$

$$\left|\partial^\beta g_n(\theta,\lambda)\right| \leq (2N_0)^{E_\rho|\beta|_1}(1+|n|)^{|\beta|_1} \tag{10.142}$$

Indeed, it follows from (10.129), (10.130), (10.141), (10.24), (10.25) and the product rule that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left|\partial^\beta\left((\alpha_1 + R(\lambda)(n,n))4\sin^2\frac{<\omega,n>+\theta}{2}\right)\right| \\ \leq \quad & (\alpha_1+1)4(1+|n|)^{|\beta|_1} + \sum_{0<\alpha\leq\beta}\begin{pmatrix}\beta\\ \alpha\end{pmatrix} N_0^{E_\rho|\alpha|_1}4(1+|n|)^{|\beta-\alpha|_1} \\ \leq \quad & 2^{|\beta|_1+2}N_0^{E_\rho|\beta|_1}(1+|n|)^{|\beta|_1} \leq (2N_0)^{E_\rho|\beta|_1}(1+|n|)^{|\beta|_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that this calculation contains a proof of (10.142) in both cases $<n,g>=0$ and $<n,g>\neq 0$.

Lower bound on $|g_n|$: We shall prove that

$$|g_n(\theta,\lambda)| \geq \frac{\gamma^2}{4\alpha_1}\frac{d_V\delta_0}{4}(1+|n|)^{-E_\delta} \tag{10.143}$$

Suppose first that $<n,g>=0$. In this case (10.143) simply follows from (10.26), $\gamma^2 < \alpha_1$ (see assumption A2) and from

$$|R(\lambda)(n,n)| \leq \frac{d_V\delta_1}{4} < \frac{d_V\delta_0}{4} \quad (\text{ see (10.129)}) . \tag{10.144}$$

Assume $< n, g > \neq 0$. We introduce the following auxiliary notation

$$\begin{aligned} x &:= 4\sin^2 \frac{< \omega, n > + \theta}{2}, \\ y &:= \alpha_1 + R(\lambda)(n,n), \\ \eta &:= \frac{d_V \delta_0}{4}(1+|n|)^{-E_\delta} \end{aligned}$$

We will show below that

$$|y - \frac{< n, g >^2 \gamma^2}{x}| = |V(\theta, \omega)(n) + R(\lambda)(n,n)| \geq \eta. \tag{10.145}$$

Suppose (10.145) holds. Then

$$\frac{1}{|y|}\left|1 + \frac{< n, g >^2 \gamma^2}{yx - < n, g >^2 \gamma^2}\right| \leq \frac{1}{\eta}.$$

Note that (10.26) and (10.144) imply $\eta < y < 2\alpha_1$. Thus

$$\frac{< n, g >^2 \gamma^2}{|yx - < n, g >^2 \gamma^2|} \leq \frac{y}{\eta} + 1, < 2\frac{y}{\eta}$$

implying

$$|g_n(\theta, \lambda)| = |yx - < n, g >^2 \gamma^2| > \gamma^2 \frac{\eta}{2y} > \frac{\gamma^2}{4\alpha_1}\eta.$$

Hence the proof of (10.143) is complete once we have verified (10.145).

Proof of (10.145): Recall from statement (α) in section 10.1.2 that

$$|V(\theta, \omega)(n)| > \frac{d_V \delta_1}{2} \tag{10.146}$$

for all $n \in \Gamma_1$. Therefore (10.144) implies

$$|V(\theta, \omega)(n) + R(\lambda)(n,n)| \geq \frac{d_V \delta_1}{4}$$

Since $(1+|n|)^{-E_\delta} \leq \delta_1$ for all $|n| \geq N_1$ (see (4.47)), we may assume that $|n| < N_1$ (in addition to the already present assumptions that $n \in \Gamma_1$ and $< n, g > \neq 0$). We distinguish the cases $| < n, g > | > \nu$ and $0 < | < n, g > | \leq \nu$. In the first case we observe that the imaginary part of $< \omega, n > + \theta$ is bounded by $\nu 2 \rho_1 N_1 + \delta_1/100 \leq \delta_1$ (use (10.27)) and thus (10.145) follows from (10.28) and (10.144). Consider now $| < n, g >= i|$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$. In this case

$$V(\theta, \omega)(n) = V_i(\theta + < \omega, n >). \tag{10.147}$$

Observe that (10.27) together with $|n| \le N_1$ implies

$$| < \omega, n > - < \omega^{(0)}, n > | \le \frac{\delta_1}{2}. \tag{10.148}$$

Next we prove

$$|V(\theta, \omega)(n)| > \frac{d_V \delta_0}{2}(1+|n|)^{-\tau}. \tag{10.149}$$

We need to distinguish the $2\nu + 1$ cases I, II_p and III_p (see (10.60)).

Case I: Since $n \in \Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma = C \setminus S$ we have $n \pm e_i \neq 0$. Therefore (10.148), (10.60), assumption A3, (10.29) and (10.30) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{dist}\Big(\theta + < \omega, n >, \{\pm\omega_i^{(0)}\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}\Big) &\ge \frac{s}{|n \mp e_i|^\tau} - \frac{1}{2}\delta_1 - \frac{101}{100}\delta_1 \\ &\ge \frac{s}{2(1+|n|)^\tau} > \frac{\delta_0}{2(1+|n|)^\tau} \end{aligned}$$

Estimate (10.149) then follows from (10.147), proposition 19.1 and (10.31).

Case II_p: We first establish that $n + 2e_p \mp e_i \neq 0$. In fact, assume that $n + 2e_p \mp e_i = 0$. Since $| < n, g > | = i$, and $p \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ this implies that $p = i$ and $n = -e_i$. This, however, contradicts the fact that $n \notin S$ (since $n \in \Gamma_1$). Therefore (10.148), (10.60), assumption A3, (10.29), $|n| + 3 \le 2(1 + |n|)$ and (10.30) imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{dist}\Big(\theta + < \omega, n >, \{\pm\omega_i^{(0)}\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}\Big) \\ \ge\ & \operatorname{dist}\Big(\theta + < \omega^{(0)}, n \mp e_i + 2e_p >, \{2\omega_p^{(0)}\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}\Big) - \frac{1}{2}\delta_1 \\ \ge\ & \frac{s}{|n \mp e_i + 2e_p|^\tau} - \frac{1}{2}\delta_1 - \frac{101}{100}\delta_1 \\ \ge\ & \frac{s}{2(3+|n|)^\tau} > \frac{\delta_0}{2(1+|n|)^\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Estimate (10.149) then follows from (10.147), proposition 19.1 and (10.31).

Case III_p: We first establish that $n - 2e_p \mp e_i \neq 0$. Assume that $n - 2e_p \mp e_i = 0$. Since $| < n, g > | = i$, and $p \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ this implies that $p = i$ and $n = e_i$. This, however, contradicts $n \notin S$. Therefore (10.148), (10.60), assumption A3, (10.29), $|n| + 3 \le 2(1 + |n|)$ and (10.30) imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{dist}\Big(\theta + < \omega, n >, \{\pm\omega_i^{(0)}\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}\Big) \\ \ge\ & \operatorname{dist}\Big(\theta + < \omega^{(0)}, n \mp e_i - 2e_p >, \{-2\omega_p^{(0)}\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}\Big) - \frac{1}{2}\delta_1 \\ \ge\ & \frac{s}{|n \mp e_i - 2e_p|^\tau} - \frac{1}{2}\delta_1 - \frac{101}{100}\delta_1 \\ \ge\ & \frac{s}{2(3+|n|)^\tau} > \frac{\delta_0}{2(1+|n|)^\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Estimate (10.149) again follows from (10.147), proposition 19.1 and (10.31).

Thus we have established (10.149) in all cases. Together with the estimate (10.146) we obtain

$$|V(\theta,\omega)(n)| > \max\left(\frac{d_V\delta_1}{2}, \frac{d_V\delta_0}{2}(1+|n|)^{-\tau}\right).$$

On the other hand (10.144) implies

$$|R(\lambda)(n,n)| \le \frac{1}{2}\max\left(\frac{d_V\delta_1}{2}, \frac{d_V\delta_0}{2}(1+|n|)^{-\tau}\right).$$

The last two inequalities together with (10.32) prove (10.145), also in the case $|n| < N_1$. The proof of (10.145) is complete. We have so far established estimates (10.141) – (10.143) on the functions f_n and g_n. We use them to complete the proof of proposition 10.136.

Applying corollary 24.10 (b) for the derivatives of quotients yields

$$\left|\partial^\beta\left(\frac{f_n}{g_n}\right)\right| \le \sum_{p=1}^{|\beta|_1+1} \sum_{\substack{\beta_1+\ldots+\beta_p=\beta \\ \beta_r\neq 0 \text{ for } 2\le r\le p}} \frac{\beta!}{\beta_1!\ldots\beta_p!}|\partial^{\beta_1}f_n||g_n|^{-p}|\partial^{\beta_2}g_n|\ldots|\partial^{\beta_p}g_n|$$

for $|\beta|_1 \ge 0$. Using proposition 24.5 and estimates (10.141), (10.142) and (10.143) we obtain with (4.27)

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\partial^\beta\left(\frac{f_n}{g_n}\right)\right| &\le \sum_{p=1}^{|\beta|_1+1} p^{|\beta|_1}\left(\frac{16\alpha_1}{d_V\gamma^2}\frac{(1+|n|)^{E_\delta}}{\delta_0}\right)^{|\beta|_1+1}(2N_0)^{E_\rho|\beta|_1}4(1+|n|)^{|\beta|_1} \\ &\le D_N^{-1}D_{1,1}\left(\frac{N_0^{E_\rho}}{\delta_0}(1+|n|)^{E_\delta+1}\right)^{|\beta|_1+1}\end{aligned}$$

for $0\le|\beta|_1\le B_0$. Proposition 10.136 now follows from (10.33).

□

Next we investigate $G^{(j+1)}_{U(n)}$ for $n\in\Gamma_l$, $2\le l\le j$. Recall that (10.70), (10.69) imply that there exists a (unique) $n'\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu$ with $n-n'\in S$ and $<n',g>=0$.

Proposition 10.150 *Suppose that the assumptions of lemma 10.134 hold. Let* $n\in\Gamma_l$, $2\le l\le j$. *Then*

$$\left\|\partial^\beta G^{(j+1)}_{U(n)}(\theta,\lambda)\right\|_{\sigma_l,c} \le D_{1,2}M_0^{|\beta|_1+1}(1+|n|)^{q(|\beta|_1+1)} \tag{10.151}$$

for $0\le|\beta|_1\le B_0$ *and* $(\theta,\lambda)\in U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda^{(j)}_{k'}),\rho_j/8)$.

Proof. (Proposition 10.150). By continuity it suffices to prove estimate (10.151) for $(\theta, \lambda) \in U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda^{(j)}_{k'}), \rho_j/8) \setminus \tilde{Z}_{U(n)}$. Let $n \in \Gamma_l$, $2 \leq l \leq j$. Recall from (10.95) that $U(n) = C_l(n') + \{n'\}$. Applying Cauchy's integral formula to induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})(4)_l$ we obtain

$$\left\| \partial^\beta G^{(l)}_{C_l(n')}(\theta, \lambda) \right\|_{\sigma_l, c} \leq \beta! M_l \left(\frac{20}{\delta_l} \right)^{\beta_\theta} \left(\frac{2}{\rho_l} \right)^{|\beta_\lambda|_1} \tag{10.152}$$

for all $(\theta, \lambda) \in U(\tilde{I}^{(l-1)}_{C_{l-1}(n'),k_{l-1}} \setminus \tilde{I}^{(l)}_{C_l(n'),k_l}, \delta_l/20) \times U(B_{\rho_l}(\lambda^{(l)}_{k_l}), \rho_l/2)$ and $|\beta|_1 \geq 0$. Observe that $< n', g >= 0$. Proposition 19.18 implies

$$G^{(l)}_{C_l(n')+\{n'\}}(\theta, \lambda) \cong G^{(l)}_{C_l(n')}(\theta + < \omega, n' >, \lambda). \tag{10.153}$$

By the definition of Γ_l (see (10.70)) we have $\theta + < \omega, n' > \in U(\tilde{I}^{(l-1)}_{C_{l-1}(n'),k_{l-1}} \setminus \tilde{I}^{(l)}_{C_l(n'),k_l}, \delta_l/20)$. Furthermore $\lambda \in U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda^{(j)}_{k'}), \rho_j/8) \subset U(B_{\rho_l}(\lambda^{(l)}_{k_l}), \rho_l/2)$. Applying the chain rule we obtain from (10.152) and (10.34) that for $|\beta|_1 \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \partial^\beta G^{(l)}_{C_l(n')+\{n'\}}(\theta, \lambda) \right\|_{\sigma_l, c} &\leq |\beta|_1! M_l \left(\frac{20}{\delta_l} \right)^{\beta_\theta} \left(|n'| \frac{20}{\delta_l} + \frac{2}{\rho_l} \right)^{|\beta_\lambda|_1} \\ &\leq |\beta|_1! M_l \left[(1 + |n|) \frac{4}{\rho_l} \right]^{|\beta|_1}. \end{aligned} \tag{10.154}$$

Finally, in view of proposition 24.11 we need to estimate the derivatives of $X := T^{(j+1)} - T^{(l)}$. To this end set for $l \leq p \leq j$

$$\begin{aligned} X_p &:= T^{(p+1)} - T^{(p)} = DW(\varphi + v_{p+1}) - DW(\varphi + v_p) \\ &= \left(\int_0^1 D^2 W(\varphi + v_p + t(v_{p+1} - v_p)) dt \right) (v_{p+1} - v_p). \end{aligned} \tag{10.155}$$

Note that X_p does not depend on θ. It follows from induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})(1b), (1d)$, $p \geq 2$ and lemma 18.1 that X_p is analytic on $U(\mathcal{N}^{(p)}, \rho_p/4)$ and

$$\|X_p(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \leq D_W e^{-\frac{1}{8} N^c_{p-1}}.$$

Applying Cauchy's integral formula and (10.35) we conclude for $\lambda \in U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda^{(j)}_{k'}), \rho_j/8) \subset U(B_{\rho_p}(\lambda^{(p)}_{k_p}), \rho_p/8)$, $l \leq p \leq j$, and $0 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq B_0$ that

$$\|\partial^\beta X(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \leq \sum_{p=l}^{j} \|\partial^\beta X_p(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \leq e^{-\frac{1}{16} N^c_{l-1}}$$

Estimate (10.36) allows the application of proposition 24.11, yielding

$$\left\| \partial^\beta G^{(j+1)}_{C_l(n')+\{n'\}}(\theta, \lambda) \right\|_{\sigma_l, c} \leq 2B_0! M_l \left[(1 + |n|) \frac{8}{\rho_l} \right]^{|\beta|_1} \left(\sum_{p=1}^{|\beta|_1 + 1} p^{|\beta|_1} D^p_N \right) \tag{10.156}$$

for $0 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq B_0$. Finally, statement ($\beta$) in section 10.1.2 implies $|n| \geq 2N_{l-1}$. Thus by (4.44), (4.45), (4.48)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\rho_l} &= N_l^{E_\rho} \leq (1+|n|)^{AE_\rho} \\ M_l &= N_l^{E_M} \leq (1+|n|)^{AE_M}. \end{aligned}$$

The definition of q (4.18), proposition 10.150 now follows from (10.156) and from the choice of the constant $D_{1,2}$ in (4.28). □

Before proving lemma 10.134 we need one more proposition.

Proposition 10.157 *Let w, $y > 0$, $t \geq 1$. Then*

$$(t+y)^w e^{-\frac{1}{4}y^c} \leq t^w \left(\max_{y \geq 0} (1+y)^w e^{-\frac{1}{4}y^c} \right).$$

The proof of this proposition is trivial and is based on the simple observation that $(t+y)^w \leq t^w(1+y)^w$ for $t \geq 1$, y, $w > 0$.

Proof. (*Lemma 10.134*).

We have used the coupling lemma 20.1 to construct G_Γ from the collection of local inverse matrices $G_{U(n)}^{(j+1)}$, $n \in \Gamma$. By (20.7), (20.10), (20.11)

$$G_\Gamma^{(j+1)} = \tilde{G}(1+Y)^{-1} \tag{10.158}$$

where for m, $n \in \Gamma$

$$\tilde{G}(m,n) = \begin{cases} G_{U(n)}^{(j+1)}(m,n) & \text{if } m \in U(n), \\ 0 & \text{else ,} \end{cases}$$

$$Y(m,n) = \begin{cases} \sum_{p \in U(n)} R(m,p)\tilde{G}(p,n) & \text{if } m \in \Gamma \setminus U(n), \\ 0 & \text{else .} \end{cases}$$

It follows from propositions 10.136, 10.150 and (10.37) that for $D := \max(D_{1,1}, D_{1,2})$ and $n \in \Gamma$

$$\sum_{m \in \Gamma} \left| \partial^\beta \tilde{G}(m,n) \right| w_{1/2,c}(m-n) \leq D M_0^{|\beta|_1+1}(1+|n|)^{q(|\beta|_1+1)} \tag{10.159}$$

for $0 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq B_0$. Next we estimate the derivatives of the matrix Y up to order $0 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq B_0$. To that end recall $\|\partial^\beta R\|_{1,c} \leq N_0^{E_\rho |\beta|_1} \leq M_0^{|\beta|_1}$ from proposition 10.128 and (10.33). Using in addition (10.159) we obtain for $n \in \Gamma$, $m \in \Gamma \setminus U(n)$

$$\left| \partial^\beta Y(m,n) \right| w_{1/2,c}(m-n)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{\alpha\leq\beta}\sum_{p\in U(n)} \binom{\beta}{\alpha} \left|\partial^{\beta-\alpha}R(m,p)\right| w_{1/2,c}(m-p) \left|\partial^{\alpha}\tilde{G}(p,n)\right| w_{1/2,c}(p-n) \\
&\leq \sum_{\alpha\leq\beta}\sum_{p\in U(n)} \binom{\beta}{\alpha} M_0^{|\beta-\alpha|_1} \left|\partial^{\alpha}\tilde{G}(p,n)\right| w_{1/2,c}(p-n) \\
&\leq \sum_{\alpha\leq\beta} \binom{\beta}{\alpha} D M_0^{|\alpha|_1+1}(1+|n|)^{q(|\alpha|_1+1)} M_0^{|\beta-\alpha|_1} \\
&\leq D(2M_0)^{|\beta|_1+1}(1+|n|)^{q(|\beta|_1+1)}. \qquad (10.160)
\end{aligned}
$$

Differentiating (10.158) (see corollary 24.10 (b)) we obtain

$$
\partial^{\beta}G_{\Gamma}^{(j+1)} = \sum_{p=1}^{|\beta|_1+1}(-1)^{p-1} \sum_{\substack{\beta_1+\ldots+\beta_p=\beta \\ \beta_r\neq 0 \text{ for } 2\leq r\leq p}} \frac{\beta!}{\beta_1!\ldots\beta_p!}(\partial^{\beta_1}\tilde{G})(1+Y)^{-1}(\partial^{\beta_2}Y)\ldots(1+Y)^{-1}. \qquad (10.161)
$$

Furthermore, (10.159), (10.160), $\|(1+Y)^{-1}\|_{1/2,c}\leq 2D_N$ (cf. (20.8)) and lemma 5.16 imply for $1\leq p\leq|\beta|_1+1$, $\beta_1+\ldots+\beta_p=\beta$, $\beta_r\neq 0$ for $2\leq r\leq p$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left|\left[(\partial^{\beta_1}\tilde{G})(1+Y)^{-1}(\partial^{\beta_2}Y)\ldots(\partial^{\beta_p}Y)(1+Y)^{-1}\right](m,n)\right| w_{1/4,c}(m-n) \\
\leq\;& w_{1/4,c}(m-n)\sum_{y_1,\ldots,y_{2p-1}\in\Gamma}(2D_N)^pD^p(2M_0)^{|\beta|_1+p}\frac{(1+|y_1|)^{q(|\beta_1|_1+1)}\ldots(1+|y_{2p-1}|)^{q(|\beta_p|_1+1)}}{w_{1/2,c}(m-y_1)\ldots w_{1/2,c}(y_{2p-1}-n)} \\
\leq\;& (2D_ND)^p(2M_0)^{|\beta|_1+p}\sum_{y_1,\ldots,y_{2p-1}\in\Gamma}\left(\frac{w_{1/4,c}(m-n)}{w_{1/4,c}(m-y_1)\ldots w_{1/4,c}(y_{2p-1}-n)}\right. \\
&\qquad\left.\times\frac{(1+|y_1|)^{q(|\beta_1|_1+1)}\ldots(1+|y_{2p-1}|)^{q(|\beta_p|_1+1)}}{e^{\frac{1}{4}(|m-y_1|^c+\ldots+|y_{2p-1}-n|^c)}}\right) \\
\leq\;& (2D_ND)^{|\beta|_1+1}(2M_0)^{2|\beta|_1+1}\left(\max_{y_1,\ldots,y_{2p-1}\in\Gamma}\frac{(1+|y_1|)^{q(|\beta_1|_1+1)}\ldots(1+|y_{2p-1}|)^{q(|\beta_p|_1+1)}}{e^{\frac{1}{4}(|m-y_1|^c+\ldots+|y_{2p-1}-n|^c)}}\right) \\
&\qquad (10.162)
\end{aligned}
$$

Denote by MAX the maximum which appears in the previous line (10.162). We claim

$$
MAX\leq(1+|n|)^{q(2|\beta|_1+1)}\left(\max_{y\geq 0}(1+y)^{q(2|\beta|_1+1)}e^{-\frac{1}{4}y^c}\right). \qquad (10.163)
$$

Indeed, since Γ is finite, the maximum is achieved, say at lattice points $y_1^*,\ldots,y_{2p-1}^*\in\Gamma$. Set $\Delta:=\max\{|y_1^*|,\ldots,|y_{2p-1}^*|\}$. In case $\Delta\leq|n|$ estimate (10.163) is obvious. If $\Delta>|n|$ we see that MAX is bounded by

$$
(1+\Delta)^{q(2|\beta|_1+1)}e^{-\frac{1}{4}(\Delta-|n|)^c}.
$$

Using proposition 10.157 with $w \equiv q(2|\beta|_1 + 1)$, $y \equiv \Delta - |n|$ and $t \equiv 1 + |n|$ we conclude that (10.163) is satisfied. Using (10.161), (10.162), (10.163), proposition 24.5 and (4.29) we have finally proved lemma 10.134. □

Corollary 10.164 *Let $j \geq 1$. Suppose that the induction statements $(\mathcal{IS})_l$, $1 \leq l \leq j$ and $(\mathcal{IS})(1)_{j+1}$ are satisfied. Then the matrix valued function b defined in (10.98) is analytic on $U(\tilde{I}^{(j)}_{C',k'}, \delta_j/100) \times U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda^{(j)}_{k'}), \rho_j/8)$ and the entries of b are uniformly bounded by*

$$|b(\theta,\lambda)(m,n)| \leq 2(D_V + 1)\delta_1 \quad \textit{for } m, n \in S. \tag{10.165}$$

Proof. The analyticity of b was already stated in remark 10.99. By definition

$$\begin{aligned} b(m,n) &= V(\theta,\omega)(m)\delta_{m,n} + R(m,n) - \sum_{y_1,y_2\in\Gamma} R(m,y_1)G^{(j+1)}_\Gamma(y_1,y_2)R(y_2,n) \\ &= I + II + III. \end{aligned} \tag{10.166}$$

It follows from remark 10.62 that $|I| \leq 2D_V\delta_1$. Furthermore estimate (10.129) together with conditions (10.41) and (10.42) imply $|II| \leq \delta_1$. Finally, by lemma 10.134, proposition 10.128, lemma 5.16 and (10.41) – (10.43)

$$\begin{aligned} |III| &\leq \sum_{y_1,y_2\in\Gamma} |R(m,y_1)G^{(j+1)}_\Gamma(y_1,y_2)R(y_2,n)| \\ &\leq \delta_1^2 \sum_{y_1,y_2\in\Gamma} D_{1,3}M_0 \frac{(1+|y_2|)^q e^{-\frac{3}{4}|y_2-n|^c}}{w_{\frac{1}{4},c}(m-y_1)w_{\frac{1}{4},c}(y_1-y_2)w_{\frac{1}{4},c}(y_2-n)} && (10.167) \\ &\leq \delta_1^2 D_{1,3}M_0 \max_{y_2\in\Gamma}\left[(1+|y_2|)^q e^{-\frac{3}{4}|y_2-n|^c}\right] \leq \delta_1. && (10.168) \end{aligned}$$

□

10.2.5 Estimates on $\tilde{R}$

Recall the definition of $\tilde{R}$ in (10.122).

Proposition 10.169 *Let $j \geq 1$. Suppose that the induction statements $(\mathcal{IS})_l$, $1 \leq l \leq j$ and $(\mathcal{IS})(1)_{j+1}$ are satisfied. Then for all $0 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq B_0$, $(\theta,\lambda) \in U(\tilde{I}^{(j)}_{C',k'}, \delta_j/100) \times U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda^{(j)}_{k'}), \rho_j/8)$ and n, $m \in S$*

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\partial^\beta \tilde{R}(n,m)\right| &\leq D_{1,4}M_0^{2|\beta|_1+1}, && (10.170) \\ \left|\partial_\theta^\beta \tilde{R}(n,m)\right| &\leq \rho_1^{3/4}. && (10.171) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The product rule implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial^\beta \tilde{R}(m,n) &= \sum_{\alpha\leq\beta} \begin{pmatrix} \beta \\ \alpha \end{pmatrix} (\partial^\alpha \tilde{D}^{-1})(m,m)(\partial^{\beta-\alpha} R)(m,n) \\
&\quad - \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1+\ldots+\alpha_4=\beta \\ y_1,y_2\in\Gamma}} \frac{\beta!}{\alpha_1!\ldots\alpha_4!}(\partial^{\alpha_1}\tilde{D}^{-1})(m,m)(\partial^{\alpha_2}R)(m,y_1)(\partial^{\alpha_3}G_\Gamma^{(j+1)})(y_1,y_2)(\partial^{\alpha_4}R)(y_2,n) \\
&= S_1 - S_2
\end{aligned} \tag{10.172}$$

It follows from (10.127), proposition 10.128 and (10.33) that

$$|S_1| \leq 2^{|\beta|_1} D_V N_0^{E_\rho|\beta|_1} \leq 2^{|\beta|_1} D_V M_0^{|\beta|_1}. \tag{10.173}$$

Using in addition (10.135), lemma 5.16 and proposition 24.5

$$\begin{aligned}
|S_2| &\leq D_V \sum_{\alpha_1+\ldots+\alpha_4=\beta} \frac{\beta!}{\alpha_1!\ldots\alpha_4!} M_0^{|\alpha_2|_1+|\alpha_4|_1} \sum_{y_1,y_2\in\Gamma} D_{1,3}M_0^{2|\alpha_3|_1+1}\frac{(1+|y_2|)^{q(2|\alpha_3|_1+1)}e^{-\frac{1}{4}|y_2-n|^c}}{w_{1/4,c}(m-y_1)\ldots w_{1/4,c}(y_2-n)} \\
&\leq D_V D_{1,3} 4^{|\beta|_1} M_0^{2|\beta|_1+1}\left(\max_{y\geq 0}(1+y)^{q(2|\beta|_1+1)}e^{-\frac{1}{4}|y-1|^c}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{10.174}$$

Claim (10.170) follows from (10.172), (10.173), (10.174) and (4.30).

The proof of claim (10.171) is similar but easier since the matrix R does not depend on θ. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_\theta^\beta \tilde{R}(m,n) &= (\partial_\theta^\beta \tilde{D}^{-1})(m,m)R(m,n) \\
&\quad - \sum_{\substack{\alpha\leq\beta \\ y_1,y_2\in\Gamma}} \begin{pmatrix} \beta \\ \alpha \end{pmatrix} (\partial_\theta^\alpha \tilde{D}^{-1})(m,m)R(m,y_1)(\partial_\theta^{\beta-\alpha}G_\Gamma^{(j+1)})(y_1,y_2)R(y_2,n) \\
&= S_1 - S_2
\end{aligned} \tag{10.175}$$

Using similar estimates as above it follows that

$$|S_1| \leq D_V 8e\nu D_W D_N \rho_1 \tag{10.176}$$

and

$$|S_2| \leq 2^{|\beta|_1} D_V (8e\nu D_W D_N\rho_1)^2 D_{1,3} M_0^{2|\beta|_1+1}\left(\max_{y\geq 0}(1+y)^{q(2|\beta|_1+1)}e^{-\frac{1}{4}|y-1|^c}\right). \tag{10.177}$$

Claim (10.171) follows from (10.175), (10.176), (10.177), and (10.38), (10.39).

□

10.2.6 Completion of the proof of lemma 10.103

Recall that we have already proved lemma 10.103 in subsections 10.2.1 and 10.2.2 except for estimates (10.110) and (10.111) We will complete the proof by showing

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\partial_\theta^\beta r(\theta,\lambda)\right| &\leq D_{1,5}\rho_1^{3/4}, & (10.178) \\ \left|\partial^\beta r(\theta,\lambda)\right| &\leq D_1 M_0^{2|\beta|_1+2\nu} & (10.179) \end{aligned}$$

for all $0 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq B_0$ and $(\theta,\lambda) \in U(\tilde{I}^{(j)}_{C',k'},\delta_j/100) \times U(B_{\rho_j}(\lambda^{(j)}_{k'}),\rho_j/8)$ and by using (10.40). The function r was defined in (10.125). The proof of (10.178) and (10.179) is a straight forward calculation. Indeed, using the representation of the determinant as a sum of products of the entries and the fact that Λ is a diagonal matrix, we can write

$$r = \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma}\prod_{i=1}^{d} a_{i,\sigma}, \tag{10.180}$$

where d denotes the cardinality of the singular set S ($d \leq 2\nu$), Σ contains less than $2^d(d!)$ elements, $a_{i,\sigma}$ denotes (up to a sign) an entry of either Λ or $\tilde{R}$ and for each $\sigma \in \Sigma$ at least one of the terms $a_{i,\sigma}$, $1 \leq i \leq d$ is an entry of $\tilde{R}$. Representation (10.180), together with (10.170), (10.171), (10.126), (4.32), (4.31) yield estimates (10.179) and (10.178).

10.3 Proof of lemma 10.57 – Application of the Weierstrass Preparation Theorem

Proof. Let $\vartheta \in I^{(j)}_{C',k'}$. Define S as in (10.61), where θ is replaced by ϑ in order to determine the case in (10.60). Suppose first that $S = \emptyset$. Then statement A of lemma 10.57 holds by proposition 10.90 (cf. remark 10.92) and (10.49). For the remainder of the proof we assume that $S \neq \emptyset$. Define q and r through lemma 10.103, by writing

$$f_{C,k'}(\theta,\lambda) = \tilde{f}(\theta,\lambda)(q(\theta,\lambda)+r(\theta,\lambda)), \tag{10.181}$$

such that (10.106) – (10.111) are satisfied. We apply the Weierstrass preparation theorem in the form of lemma 21.4 to the function

$$f(z,\lambda) := q(z+\vartheta,\lambda) + r(z+\vartheta,\lambda). \tag{10.182}$$

In the notation of lemma 21.4 we set $d \equiv \#S$, $\delta \equiv \delta_j/100$, $\rho \equiv 2\tilde{\rho}_j$, $\epsilon \equiv \sqrt{\rho_1}$, B_1, B_2 as in (4.20), (4.21), $C^* \equiv D_1 M_0^{2(B_0+\nu)}$, $C \equiv 30C^*B_1!2^{B_1}$, $\lambda_0 \equiv \lambda^{(j+0.5)}_{\tilde{k}}$.

Assumptions (21.5) – (21.11) of lemma 21.4 are satisfied by (10.45) – (10.48). The analyticity of f as defined in (10.182) follows from lemma 10.103 since $\vartheta \in I^{(j)}_{C',k'}$, $\lambda^{(j+0.5)}_{\tilde{k}} \in B_{\rho_j}(\lambda^{(j)}_{k'})$ and $2\tilde{\rho}_j \le \rho_j/4$ by (10.49). Furthermore f is of the form (21.12), where (21.15) follows from (10.110), (10.111) and (10.44). To verify (21.13) and (21.14) observe that

$$q(z+\vartheta,\lambda) = (z+(\vartheta-\theta_\iota))^d + \sum_{0\le l<d} \tilde{a}_l(\lambda)(z+(\vartheta-\theta_\iota))^l = z^d + \sum_{0\le l<d} a_l(\lambda) z^l,$$

with

$$a_l(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} d \\ l \end{pmatrix} (\vartheta-\theta_\iota)^{d-l} + \sum_{l\le r<d} \tilde{a}_r(\lambda) \begin{pmatrix} r \\ l \end{pmatrix} (\vartheta-\theta_\iota)^{r-l} \quad \text{for } 0 \le l < d.$$

Since $\vartheta \in I^{(j)}_{C',k'}$ the definition of θ_ι implies $|\vartheta - \theta_\iota| < \delta_1 \le \frac{1}{2}$ (see also (10.52)). Using (10.108), (10.109), (10.50) and (10.51) we obtain for $0 \le l < d$

$$|a_l(\lambda)| \le 2^{2\nu}\delta_1 + 2^{4\nu+1}\rho_1 \le \frac{1}{8d}.$$

and

$$\left|\partial^\beta a_l(\lambda)\right| \le 3^{3\nu}2^{2\nu} < 2^{8\nu} < 2^{B_1} < C.$$

The hypothesis of lemma 21.4 are therefore satisfied and we obtain functions Q and b_i satisfying (21.16) – (21.20). Set

$$p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta}(\theta,\lambda) := \theta^d + \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} b_i(\lambda)\theta^i.$$

Statement (a) is then trivially satisfied. Statements (c) – (e) follow from (21.18) – (21.20) and (4.33). Claim (f) is certainly true in the case $d = 1$ and follows for $d \ge 2$ from (21.18) and (10.52) via

$$\left|\partial_\theta p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta}(\theta,\lambda)\right| \le d\sum_{k=1}^{d-1}\left(\frac{\delta_1}{2}\right)^k + \frac{1}{2d} \le d\delta_1 + \frac{1}{2d} \le 1.$$

It remains to prove (b). It follows from (10.181), (10.106), (10.182), (21.16) and (21.17) that

$$|f_{C,k'}(\theta,\lambda)| \ge \frac{1}{2} d_V^{2\nu} |p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta}(\theta-\vartheta,\lambda)| \tag{10.183}$$

for all $(\theta,\lambda) \in U(\vartheta,\delta_j/400) \times U(\lambda^{(j+0.5)}_{\tilde{k}}, 2\tilde{\rho}_j)$. Using the cofactor matrix to represent the inverse of $b(\theta,\lambda)$ we obtain from corollary 10.164

$$\|b^{-1}(\theta,\lambda)\|_{1,c} \le dD_N e^2 \frac{(d-1)![2(D_V+1)\delta_1]^{d-1}}{|f_{C,k'}(\theta,\lambda)|} \tag{10.184}$$

for all $(\theta, \lambda) \in U(\vartheta, \delta_j/400) \times U(\lambda_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+0.5)}, 2\tilde{\rho}_j)$ with $f_{C,k'}(\theta, \lambda) \neq 0$. Using hypothesis (10.53) one arrives at

$$\|b^{-1}(\theta, \lambda)\|_{1,c} \leq \frac{1}{|p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta}(\theta - \vartheta, \lambda)|\delta_1}$$

for all $(\theta, \lambda) \in U(\vartheta, \delta_j/400) \times U(\lambda_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+0.5)}, 2\tilde{\rho}_j)$ with $p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta}(\theta - \vartheta, \lambda) \neq 0$. Claim (b) then follows from (10.101), proposition 10.90 and (10.129). □

10.4 Definition of $\mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)}$

In this section we again assume that $j \geq 1$ and that induction statements $(\mathcal{IS})_l$, $1 \leq l \leq j$, $(\mathcal{IS})(1)_{j+1}$ are satisfied. Let $C' \in \mathcal{C}^{(j)}$ and $k' \in K^{(j)}$. Using (10.54) and

$$I_{C',k'}^{(j)} \subset (-\delta_1, \delta_1) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{\nu}([2\omega_i^{(0)}] - \delta_1, [2\omega_i^{(0)}] + \delta_1) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{\nu}([-2\omega_i^{(0)}] - \delta_1, [-2\omega_i^{(0)}] + \delta_1)$$

(cf. (6.9)) it is clear that we can find a set $\Theta_{C',k'} \subset I_{C',k'}^{(j)}$ satisfying

$$\Theta_{C',k'} \text{ contains at most } \delta_j^{-1} \text{ elements} . \tag{10.185}$$

$$I_{C',k'}^{(j)} \subset \bigcup_{\vartheta \in \Theta_{C',k'}} B_{\delta_j/800}(\vartheta). \tag{10.186}$$

We are ready to define the set of polynomials $\mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)}$, where we use the notation $p \ominus q$ introduced in section 23, definition 23.24.

Definition 10.187 *Let* $\tilde{k} \in K^{(j+0.5)}$*. Set* $k' := \pi_j^{(j+0.5)}\tilde{k}$*. For* $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(j+1)}$ *we define* C' *as in (10.58).*

$$\mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)} := \mathcal{PI}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)} \cup \mathcal{PII}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)} \cup \mathcal{PIII}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)}, \tag{10.188}$$

where

$$\mathcal{PI}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)} := \{(q, 0)\} \text{ with } q(\theta, \lambda) := \theta, \tag{10.189}$$

$$\mathcal{PII}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)} := \{(p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta}, \vartheta) : C \in \mathcal{C}^{(j+1)}, \vartheta \in \Theta_{C',k'}\}, \tag{10.190}$$

$$\mathcal{PIII}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)} := \{(p_{C_1,\tilde{k},\vartheta_1} \ominus p_{C_2,\tilde{k},\vartheta_2}, [\vartheta_1 - \vartheta_2]) : C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}^{(j+1)}, \vartheta_1 \in \Theta_{C_1',k'}, \vartheta_2 \in \Theta_{C_2',k'}\}. \tag{10.191}$$

The following proposition is a consequence of lemma 10.57, lemma 23.11, (4.51), (4.38), proposition 24.5, (4.50), and (10.185).

Proposition 10.192 *Let* $j \geq 1$, $\tilde{k} \in K^{(j+0.5)}$ *and assume that induction statements* $(\mathcal{IS})_{1 \leq l \leq j}$, $(\mathcal{IS})(1)_{j+1}$ *hold. Then* $\mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)} \subset \mathcal{POL}$ *and* $\mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)}$ *contains at most* $1 + (2N_j)^{2\nu}\delta_j^{-1} + (2N_j)^{4\nu}\delta_j^{-2}$ *elements.*

11 Completion of the induction step $j \to j+1$

In this section we will use the polynomials constructed in section 10 to define sets $K^{(j+1)}$, $\mathcal{N}^{(j+1)}$ and $I_{C,k}^{(j+1)}$ such that induction statements $(\mathcal{IS})_{j+1}(2)-(4)$ are satisfied. We first state the estimates of lemma 4.54 used in this section.

Estimates of lemma 4.54 used in section 11:

$$D_K \geq 2 \tag{11.1}$$

$$40\nu\rho_{j+1}N_{j+1} < \delta_{j+1} \tag{11.2}$$

$$4\nu D_P(4\nu^2 N_{j+1} + 6M_0^{4(B_0+\nu)})\rho_{j+1} \leq \delta_{j+1} \tag{11.3}$$

$$5\delta_1 < \frac{s}{8^\tau} \tag{11.4}$$

$$\delta_{j+1} \geq s d_{\tau,c} e^{-\frac{1}{2}N_j^c} \tag{11.5}$$

$$4D_N^2 M_j(1 + 16D_N^2 M_j \delta_{j+1}^{-1}\delta_1^{-1}) \leq M_{j+1} \tag{11.6}$$

$$80\delta_{j+1} \leq \delta_j \tag{11.7}$$

Lemma 11.8 *Let* $j \geq 1$. *Assume that induction statements* $(\mathcal{IS})_l$, $1 \leq l \leq j$, $(\mathcal{IS})(1)_{j+1}$ *are satisfied. Then there exist sets* $K^{(j+0.5)}$, $K^{(j+1)}$, $\mathcal{N}^{(j+1)}$ *and* $I_{C,k}^{(j+1)}$ *(for* $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(j+1)}$, $k \in K^{(j+1)}$*), such that induction statements* $(\mathcal{IS})_{j+1}(2) - (4)$ *are satisfied.*

Proof. We define $K^{(j+0.5)}$ to be the set of indices which is generated by the cube decomposition of the set $\mathcal{N}^{(j)}$ into sub-cubes of radius $\tilde{\rho}_j$ (see section 4 J, (10.55)). We decompose this set $\mathcal{N}^{(j)}$ further into sub-cubes of radius ρ_{j+1} (see (10.56)), generating a set of indices $\hat{K}^{(j+1)}$ and a corresponding set of cube midpoints $\{\lambda_k^{(j+1)} : k \in \hat{K}^{(j+1)}\}$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathcal{N}^{(j)}} &= \bigcup_{k \in \hat{K}^{(j+1)}} \overline{B_{\rho_{j+1}}(\lambda_k^{(j+1)})}, \\ B_{\rho_{j+1}}(\lambda_{k_1}^{(j+1)}) \cap B_{\rho_{j+1}}(\lambda_{k_2}^{(j+1)}) &= \emptyset \quad \text{for } k_1, k_2 \in \hat{K}^{(j+1)},\ k_1 \neq k_2. \end{aligned}$$

For $k \in \hat{K}^{(j+1)}$ we denote by $\tilde{k} := \pi_{j+0.5}^{(j+1)} k \in K^{(j+0.5)}$. Recall the definition of the constant D_K in (4.39) and set

$$\begin{aligned} K^{(j+1)} &:= \hat{K}^{(j+1)} \setminus \bigcup_{2N_j<|m|\leq 2N_{j+1}} K_m^{(j+1)} \quad \text{where} \\ K_m^{(j+1)} &:= \{k \in \hat{K}^{(j+1)} : \exists (p,\vartheta) \in \mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)} \text{ with } |p([<\omega_k^{(j+1)}, m>] - \vartheta, \lambda_k^{(j+1)})| < D_K \delta_{j+1} \\ &\qquad \text{and } |[<\omega_k^{(j+1)}, m>] - \vartheta| < \frac{\delta_1}{5}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{11.9}$$

Furthermore, we define

$$\mathcal{N}^{(j+1)} := \bigcup_{k \in K^{(j+1)}} B_{\rho_{j+1}}(\lambda_k^{(j+1)}). \tag{11.10}$$

For $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(j+1)}$, $k \in K^{(j+1)}$ we denote C' as defined in (10.58), $\tilde{k} := \pi_{j+0.5}^{(j+1)} k$ and $k' := \pi_j^{(j+1)} k$. Set

$$\begin{aligned} I_{C,k}^{(j+1)} := \{\theta \in I_{C',k'}^{(j)} \quad : \quad & \exists \vartheta \in \Theta_{C',k'} \text{ such that } p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta} \text{ exists }, |\theta - \vartheta| < \frac{\delta_1}{20}, \\ & \text{and } |p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta}(\theta - \vartheta, \lambda_k^{(j+1)})| < \delta_{j+1}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{11.11}$$

Recall that $p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta}$ exists if and only if the set S is not empty. The set S was defined in (10.61). In order to determine the case we replace θ in (10.60) by ϑ.

We now show that the inductive statements $(\mathcal{IS})_{j+1}(2) - (4)$ are satisfied.

$(2a)_{j+1}$: The statement is obvious from the definition (11.10) of $\mathcal{N}^{(j+1)}$.

$(2b)_{j+1}$: Fix $\tilde{k} \in K^{(j+0.5)}$. Using definitions (11.10), (11.9) we see

$$\left(\overline{\mathcal{N}^{(j)}} \setminus \overline{\mathcal{N}^{(j+1)}}\right) \cap \overline{B_{\tilde{\rho}_j}\left(\lambda_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+0.5)}\right)} \subset \bigcup_{2N_j<|m|\leq 2N_{j+1}} \quad \bigcup_{\substack{k \,\in\, K_m^{(j+1)} \\ \pi_{j+0.5}^{(j+1)} k = \tilde{k}}} \overline{B_{\rho_{j+1}}(\lambda_k^{(j+1)})}.$$

This means that for $\lambda \in \left(\overline{\mathcal{N}^{(j)}} \setminus \overline{\mathcal{N}^{(j+1)}}\right) \cap \overline{B_{\tilde{\rho}_j}\left(\lambda_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+0.5)}\right)}$. there exist $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ with $2N_j < |m| \leq 2N_{j+1}$, $k \in \hat{K}^{(j+1)}$ with $\pi_{j+0.5}^{(j+1)} k = \tilde{k}$ and $(p,\vartheta) \in \mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)}$ such that

$$|\lambda - \lambda_k^{(j+1)}| \leq \rho_{j+1}, \tag{11.12}$$

$$|p([<\omega_k^{(j+1)}, m>] - \vartheta, \lambda_k^{(j+1)})| < D_K \delta_{j+1}, \tag{11.13}$$

$$|[<\omega_k^{(j+1)}, m>] - \vartheta| < \frac{\delta_1}{5}. \tag{11.14}$$

Recall from proposition 10.192 that $p \in \mathcal{POL}$ and therefore the first order derivatives of p are bounded by

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\partial_\theta p| &\le 8\nu^2 D_P, && (11.15)\\
|\partial_{\lambda_i} p| &\le 2D_p M_0^{4(B_0+\nu)} && (11.16)
\end{aligned}
$$

on the set $\{|\theta| \le 1/2\} \times B_{\tilde{\rho}_j}\left(\lambda_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+0.5)}\right)$. Using in addition (11.3), induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})(2b)_{j+1}$ follows, as soon as we have established the estimates

$$
\left|[< \omega, m >] - [< \omega_k^{(j+1)}, m >]\right| \le 2\nu N_{j+1}\rho_{j+1} \le \frac{\delta_1}{5}. \tag{11.17}
$$

The latter inequality in (11.17) is a consequence of condition (11.2). The first inequality of (11.17) seems to be a direct consequence of (11.12). However, since the function $[\cdot]$ is discontinuous at points with real parts in the set $(2\mathbb{Z}+1)\pi$ we need to establish that

$$
\operatorname{dist}(\vartheta, (2\mathbb{Z}+1)\pi) \ge \frac{\delta_1}{2}. \tag{11.18}
$$

Observe that the definitions of $\mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)}$ and $\Theta_{C',k'}^{(j+1)}$ in section 10.4 imply that

$$
\operatorname{dist}(\vartheta, \{0\} \cup \{\pm 2\omega_j^{(0)} : 1 \le j \le \nu\} \cup \{\pm 2\omega_i^{(0)} \pm 2\omega_j^{(0)} : 1 \le i, j \le \nu\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) \le 2\delta_1.
$$

Furthermore, assumption A3 together with (11.4) imply that

$$
\operatorname{dist}(< \omega^{(0)}, n >, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) > 5\delta_1 \quad \text{for all } 0 < |n| \le 8,
$$

yielding (11.18) by contradiction.

$(2c)_{j+1}$: The statement follows from proposition 10.192.

$(3a)_{j+1}$: The statement is an immediate consequence of definition (11.11).

$(3b)_{j+1}$: Let $\lambda \in U(\mathcal{N}^{(j+1)}, \rho_{j+1})$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ with $2N_j < |m| \le 2N_{j+1}$. Then there exists a $k \in K^{(j+1)}$ such that $\lambda \in U_{2\rho_{j+1}}(\lambda_k^{(j+1)})$. Set $\tilde{k} := \pi_{j+0.5}^{(j+1)} k$. Since $\mathcal{PI}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)} \subset \mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)}$ (see (10.188)) the definition of $K^{(j+1)}$ in (11.9) implies

$$
|[< \omega_k^{(j+1)}, m >]| \ge D_K \delta_{j+1}.
$$

Using in addition that $|\omega - \omega_k^{(j+1)}| < 2\rho_{j+1}$ together with (11.2) we obtain

$$
\operatorname{dist}(< \omega, m >, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) = |[< \omega, m >]| \ge (D_K - 1)\delta_{j+1}.
$$

Statement $(3b)_{j+1}$ now follows from (11.1) and (11.5).

$(3c)_{j+1}$: Let $k \in K^{(j+1)}$, $\lambda \in U(B_{\rho_{j+1}}(\lambda_k^{(j+1)}), \rho_{j+1})$, $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(j+1)}$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ with $2N_j < |m| \le 2N_{j+1}$. From (11.1), (11.9), (11.11) and $\mathcal{PII}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)} \subset \mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)}$ (see (10.188)) it follows by contradiction that

$$[<\omega_k^{(j+1)}, m>] \in (-\pi, \pi] \setminus I_{C,k}^{(j+1)}. \tag{11.19}$$

This implies

$$<\omega_k^{(j+1)}, m> \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{I}_{C,k}^{(j+1)}. \tag{11.20}$$

The claim now follows from (11.2).

$(3d)_{j+1}$: Proof by contradiction: Let $k \in K^{(j+1)}$, $\lambda \in U(B_{\rho_{j+1}}(\lambda_k^{(j+1)}), \rho_{j+1})$, $\theta \in \mathbb{C}$, C_1, $C_2 \in \mathcal{C}^{(j+1)}$, m, $n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ with $2N_j < |n-m| \le 2N_{j+1}$ and assume that

$$\begin{aligned} \theta + <\omega, m> &\in U\left(\tilde{I}_{C_1,k}^{(j+1)}, \frac{\delta_{j+1}}{10}\right) \quad \text{and} \\ \theta + <\omega, n> &\in U\left(\tilde{I}_{C_2,k}^{(j+1)}, \frac{\delta_{j+1}}{10}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $B(I_{C,1}^{(1)}, \delta_1) \subset (-\pi, \pi)$ for any $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(1)}$ (see $(\mathcal{IS})(3a)_{j=1}$) we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} [\theta + <\omega, m>] &\in U\left(I_{C_1,k}^{(j+1)}, \frac{\delta_{j+1}}{10}\right) \quad \text{and} \\ [\theta + <\omega, n>] &\in U\left(I_{C_2,k}^{(j+1)}, \frac{\delta_{j+1}}{10}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Set $\tilde{k} := \pi_{j+0.5}^{(j+1)} k$, $k' := \pi_j^{(j+1)} k$ and C_1', C_2' according to (10.58).

Using statement (f) in lemma 10.57 and definition (11.11) there exist $\vartheta_1 \in \Theta_{C_1',k'}$, $\vartheta_2 \in \Theta_{C_2',k'}$ such that

$$\left| p_{C_1,\tilde{k},\vartheta_1}\left([\theta + <\omega, m>] - \vartheta_1, \lambda_k^{(j+1)}\right)\right| < \frac{11}{10}\delta_{j+1}, \tag{11.21}$$

$$\left| p_{C_2,\tilde{k},\vartheta_2}\left([\theta + <\omega, n>] - \vartheta_2, \lambda_k^{(j+1)}\right)\right| < \frac{11}{10}\delta_{j+1} \tag{11.22}$$

and $|[\theta + <\omega, m>] - \vartheta_1| < \delta_1/14$, $|[\theta + <\omega, n>] - \vartheta_2| < \delta_1/14$; here we have used that (11.7) yields $\delta_1/20 + \delta_{j+1}/10 \le \delta_1/14$. Introduce the auxiliary variables

$$x := [\theta + <\omega, m>] - \vartheta_1 \;, \quad y := [\theta + <\omega, n>] - \vartheta_2.$$

We calculate

$$x - y = [x - y] = [<\omega, m-n> - (\vartheta_1 - \vartheta_2)] = [<\omega, m-n>] - [\vartheta_1 - \vartheta_2], \tag{11.23}$$

where the last equality is justified by $|x-y| < \delta_1/7$ and by $\operatorname{dist}([\vartheta_1 - \vartheta_2], (2\mathbb{Z}+1)\pi) \geq \delta_1/2$ (see (11.18) above with $\vartheta = [\vartheta_1 - \vartheta_2]$). Define

$$(q, \vartheta) := (p_{C_1,\tilde{k},\vartheta_1} \ominus p_{C_2,\tilde{k},\vartheta_2}, [\vartheta_1 - \vartheta_2]).$$

Since $\mathcal{PIII}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)} \subset \mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)}$ we observe that $(q, \vartheta) \in \mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)}$. Using the notation of lemma 23.11 one obtains

$$q(x-y) = R_1(x,y) p_{C_1,\tilde{k},\vartheta_1}(x, \lambda_k^{(j+1)}) + R_2(x,y) p_{C_2,\tilde{k},\vartheta_2}(y, \lambda_k^{(j+1)}).$$

From (11.21), (11.22), (11.23), lemma 23.11, lemma 10.57 B (c) and the definition of D_K (4.39) it follows that

$$|q([<\omega, m-n>] - \vartheta, \lambda_k^{(j+1)})| \leq (D_K - \nu^2 D_P)\delta_{j+1}. \tag{11.24}$$

Repeating the derivation of (11.17) in the proof of statement $(2b)_{j+1}$ we obtain

$$|[<\omega, m-n>] - [<\omega_k^{(j+1)}, m-n>]| \leq 4\nu N_{j+1}\rho_{j+1} \leq \frac{\delta_{j+1}}{10} \quad \text{(cf. (11.2))}. \tag{11.25}$$

Since $|\partial_\theta q| \leq 8\nu^2 D_P$ (cf. (11.15)) estimates (11.24) and (11.25) yield

$$|q([<\omega_k^{(j+1)}, m-n>] - \vartheta, \lambda_k^{(j+1)})| < D_K \delta_{j+1}. \tag{11.26}$$

In addition, (11.23), (11.2), and (11.7) imply

$$\begin{aligned} |[<\omega_k^{(j+1)}, m-n>] - \vartheta| &\leq |x-y| + |[<\omega, m-n>] - [<\omega_k^{(j+1)}, m-n>]| \\ &\leq \frac{\delta_1}{7} + \frac{\delta_{j+1}}{10} < \frac{\delta_1}{5}. \end{aligned}$$

By definition (11.9) we conclude $k \in K_{m-n}^{(j+1)}$, contradicting the assumption that $k \in K^{(j+1)}$.

$(4)_{j+1}$: Let $k \in K^{(j+1)}$, $C \in \mathcal{C}^{(j+1)}$. Set $k' := \pi_j^{(j+1)} k$, $\tilde{k} := \pi_{j+0.5}^{(j+1)} k$ and define C' as in (10.58). Let $(\theta, \lambda) \in U(\tilde{I}_{C',k'}^{(j)} \setminus \tilde{I}_{C,k}^{(j+1)}, \delta_{j+1}/10) \times U(B_{\rho_{j+1}}(\lambda_k^{(j+1)}), \rho_{j+1})$. Recall from the construction of the inverse matrix $G_C^{(j+1)}(\theta, \lambda)$ in section 10 that we need to distinguish the cases whether the singular set S defined in (10.61) is empty or not. If $S = \emptyset$ then statement A of lemma 10.57 holds and estimate (7.1) follows from (10.59), (11.6), and (11.7). Assume now that $S \neq \emptyset$. There exists $\tilde{\theta} \in I_{C',k'}^{(j)} \setminus I_{C,k}^{(j+1)}$ satisfying

$$|[\theta] - \tilde{\theta}| < \delta_{j+1}/10 \leq \delta_j/800 \tag{11.27}$$

(see (11.7)) and a $\vartheta \in \Theta_{C',k'}$ such that $|\tilde{\theta} - \vartheta| < \delta_j/800$ (see (10.186)). Hence

$$||[\theta] - \vartheta| < \frac{\delta_j}{400}. \tag{11.28}$$

Note that $(p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta}, \vartheta) \in \mathcal{PII}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)} \subset \mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)}$ and since $\tilde{\theta} \notin I_{C,k}^{(j+1)}$ definition (11.11) implies

$$|p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta}(\tilde{\theta} - \vartheta, \lambda_k^{(j+1)})| \geq \delta_{j+1}.$$

Using statement B (f) of lemma 10.57 and (11.27) we conclude

$$|p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta}([\theta] - \vartheta, \lambda_k^{(j+1)})| > \frac{9}{10}\delta_{j+1}.$$

The estimate on the first derivatives of $p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta}$ with respect to λ (see (11.16)), $|\lambda - \lambda_k^{(j+1)}| < 2\rho_{j+1}$ and (11.3) imply

$$|p_{C,\tilde{k},\vartheta}([\theta] - \vartheta, \lambda)| > \frac{1}{2}\delta_{j+1}. \tag{11.29}$$

Statement B (b) of lemma 10.57 together with (11.6) yield the estimate (7.1). It follows from the constructions in section 10 that $G_C^{(j+1)}$ is analytic and represents the inverse of $T_C^{(j+1)}$ except on the set $\tilde{Z}_C$. Realness of the entries of $G_C^{(j+1)}$ follow from realness of the matrix $T_C^{(j+1)}$, which in turn is a consequence of $(\mathcal{IS})(1g)_{j+1}$ and proposition 19.15. □

12 Solution of the $\mathcal{P}$ – equation

In this section we use the induction statements proved in sections 6 – 11 to produce a solution of the P - equation and to show a few properties of this solution.

Estimate of lemma 4.54 used in section 12:

$$e^{2\nu-6} D_\psi (B_1 + 1) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{8}{\rho_{j+1}} \right)^{B_1+1} e^{-\frac{1}{8}N_j^c} \right) \leq 1. \tag{12.1}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}^\infty &:= \bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} \overline{\mathcal{N}^{(j)}}, & (12.2)\\ v(\lambda) &:= \lim_{j\to\infty} v_j(\lambda) \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathcal{N}^{(1)} \ \ (= B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)}),\ \text{see (6.6)})\ . & (12.3) \end{aligned}$$

The existence of the limit v and the proof of theorem 12.4 below is a consequence of the induction statements $(\mathcal{IS})(1)_{j\geq 1}$, $(\mathcal{IS})(3b)_{j\geq 1}$ and of the definition of D_3 in (4.34)

Theorem 12.4 *The function*

$$v : U(B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)}), \rho_1) \to X_{1,c},$$

defined in (12.3) exists and satisfies

- *(a)* v *is a* C^∞ *– function.*
- *(b)* $\mathcal{P}(v(\lambda), \lambda) = 0$ *for all* $\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^\infty$*.*
- *(c)* $\|v(\lambda)\|_{1,c} \leq D_3 N_0^{\tau+1} |a|^2$ *for all* $\lambda \in U(B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)}), \rho_1)$*.*
- *(d)* $\|\partial^\beta(\varphi(a) + v(\lambda))\|_{1,c} \leq D_3 N_0^{E_\rho(|\beta|_1 - 1)}$ *for all* $\lambda \in U(B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)}), \rho_1)$ *and* $1 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq B_1 + 1$*.*
- *(e) For all* $\lambda \in U(B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)}), \rho_1)$ *the support of* $v(\lambda)$ *is contained in* $\mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus (\mathcal{S} \cup \{0\})$*.*
- *(f) For all* $\lambda \in B(B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)}), \rho_1)$ *and* $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ *we have* $v(\lambda)(m) = v(\lambda)(-m) \in \mathbb{R}$*.*
- *(g) Let* $\lambda = (a, \omega) \in U(B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)}), \rho_1)$ *with* $a_i = 0$ *for some* $1 \leq i \leq \nu$*. Then* $v(\lambda)(m) = 0$ *if* $m_i \neq 0$*.*
- *(h) Let* $\lambda = (a, \omega) \in \mathcal{N}^\infty$ *and* $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus \{0\}$*. Then dist*$(<\omega, m>, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) \geq s d_{\tau,c} e^{-\frac{1}{2}|m|^c}$*.*

Chapter III

The Bifurcation Equation

In this chapter we solve the bifurcation equation (section 13), provide lower bounds for the measure of the set of non-resonant parameters (section 14), and prove our main result, theorem 2.19, in section 15.

13 Solution of the $\mathcal{Q}$-equation

In this section we will first show by a standard implicit function theorem that the bifurcation equation ($Q-$equation) can be solved for ω. Observe that the bifurcation is degenerate. However, we will use property (g) of the solution of the $P-$equation (see theorem 12.4) to factor out the degeneracy. In the remaining part of the section we derive estimates on the derivatives of the implicitly defined function ω.

Estimates of lemma 4.54 used in section 13:

$$4\nu^2 D_{4,1} N_0^{2E_\rho} \rho_1 \le d_V \tag{13.1}$$

$$\rho_1 < \delta_V \tag{13.2}$$

$$2\nu D_{4,1} N_0^{E_\rho} \tilde{\rho}_1 \le \rho_1 d_V \tag{13.3}$$

Theorem 13.4 *Assume that v is defined by (12.3). Then there exists an unique C^∞ – function*

$$\omega : \mathbb{R}^\nu \supset B_{\tilde{\rho}_1}(0) \to B_{\rho_1}(\omega^{(0)}) \subset \mathbb{R}^\nu, \tag{13.5}$$

such that for $\lambda(a) := (a, \omega(a))$ we have

$$\mathcal{Q}(v(\lambda(a)), \lambda(a)) = 0 \quad \textit{for all } a \in B_{\tilde{\rho}_1}(0). \tag{13.6}$$

Furthermore, the derivatives of ω up to order B_1 can be estimated by

$$|\partial^\alpha \omega(a)| \le \left(D_4 N_0^{B_1 E_\rho}\right)^{2|\alpha|_1 - 1} \qquad \textit{for } 1 \le |\alpha|_1 \le B_1,\ |a| < \tilde{\rho}_1. \tag{13.7}$$

The proof of theorem 13.4 proceeds in several steps. In section 13.1 we define a map $\tilde{h} : B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)}) \to \mathbb{R}^\nu$ such that $\tilde{h}(\lambda) = 0$ implies $\mathcal{Q}(v(\lambda), \lambda) = 0$. In section 13.2 we show $\tilde{h}(\lambda^{(0)}) = 0$ and the invertibility of the derivative $D_\omega \tilde{h}(\lambda^{(0)})$. Consequently we can apply the implicit function theorem and obtain a function ω defined on some neighborhood $B_{\tilde{\rho}}(0)$ of the origin in $\mathbb{R}^\nu$ satisfying $\tilde{h}(a, \omega(a)) = 0$ for $a \in B_{\tilde{\rho}}(0)$. We proceed in section 13.3 to show various estimates for the functions $\tilde{h}$, ω and their derivatives which imply $\tilde{\rho} \geq \tilde{\rho}_1$ and the estimate (13.7). This proves theorem 13.4. Moreover, the estimates of proposition 13.24 will also be used in the subsequent section 14 to obtain lower bounds on the measure of the set $\{a : (a, \omega(a)) \in \mathcal{N}^\infty\}$.

13.1 Symmetry reductions of the $\mathcal{Q}$-equation

We define

$$\begin{aligned} h \quad &: \quad B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)}) \ni (a, \omega) \mapsto h(a, \omega) \in \mathbb{R}^\nu, \\ & h_j(a, \omega) := \mathcal{Q}(v(a, \omega), (a, \omega))(e_j) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \nu. \end{aligned} \tag{13.8}$$

Indeed, we know from theorem 12.4 (a), (f) that all h_j are real-valued C^∞-functions. Furthermore,

$$\mathcal{Q}(v(a, \omega), (a, \omega))(e_j) = \mathcal{Q}(v(a, \omega), (a, \omega))(-e_j) \quad \text{for all } (a, \omega) \in B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)}), 1 \leq j \leq \nu.$$

Therefore it suffices to determine the zeros of h in order to solve the Q-equation.

Statement (g) of theorem 12.4 implies

$$h_j(a, \omega) = 0 \quad \text{if } a_j = 0. \tag{13.9}$$

Set $\hat{a}_j := a - a_j e_j$ the vector which equals a except at the j-th component, which is set to be zero. Then (13.9) and the fundamental theorem of calculus yield

$$h_j(a, \omega) = a_j \left(\int_0^1 \frac{\partial h_j}{\partial a_j}(\hat{a}_j + t a_j e_j, \omega) dt \right) \tag{13.10}$$

Therefore we can define a C^∞-function

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h} \quad &: \quad B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)}) \ni (a, \omega) \mapsto \tilde{h}(a, \omega) \in \mathbb{R}^\nu, \\ & \tilde{h}_j(a, \omega) := \int_0^1 \frac{\partial h_j}{\partial a_j}(\hat{a}_j + t a_j e_j, \omega) dt \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \nu, \end{aligned} \tag{13.11}$$

satisfying

$$h_j(a, \omega) = a_j \tilde{h}_j(a, \omega). \tag{13.12}$$

Note that the zero-set of $\tilde{h}$ is contained in the zero-set of h.

13.2 Towards a solution of the reduced equations

In this subsection we will show that

$$\tilde{h}(\lambda^{(0)}) = 0, \tag{13.13}$$

$$(D_\omega \tilde{h})(\lambda^{(0)}) \quad \text{is invertible .} \tag{13.14}$$

It follows then from the implicit function theorem that there exists a $\tilde{\rho} > 0$ and a function ω such that $\tilde{h}(a, \omega(a)) = 0$ for all $a \in B_{\tilde{\rho}}(0)$. However, since we need to show that $\tilde{\rho}$ can be chosen to equal $\tilde{\rho}_1$ we will defer the application of the implicit function theorem to section 13.3 (see proposition 13.24 below) where we provide the necessary estimates on the function $\tilde{h}$ and its derivatives to guarantee that ω can be defined on all of $B_{\tilde{\rho}_1}(0)$.

We introduce the following notation

$$\begin{aligned} u(a,\omega) &:= \varphi(a) + v(a,\omega) \quad \text{for } (a,\omega) \in B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)}), & (13.15)\\ l(a,\omega) &:= (l_j(a,\omega))_{1 \le j \le \nu} \quad \text{where } l_j(a,\omega) := a_j \left(\alpha_1 - \frac{(j\gamma)^2}{4\sin^2(\frac{\omega_j}{2})} \right), & (13.16)\\ n(a,\omega) &:= (n_j(a,\omega))_{1 \le j \le \nu} \quad \text{where } n_j(a,\omega) := W(u(a,\omega))(e_j). & (13.17) \end{aligned}$$

Recall from (3.12) and (13.8) that

$$h = l + n. \tag{13.18}$$

It follows from statement (g) of theorem 12.4 that $v(a,\omega) = 0$ for $a = 0$. We conclude that

$$\partial_\omega^\beta u(0,\omega) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \omega \in B_{\rho_1}(\omega^{(0)}), |\beta|_1 \ge 0. \tag{13.19}$$

Since W only contains term of order ≥ 2 it is clear (see lemma 18.1) that

$$DW(0) = 0. \tag{13.20}$$

The following statements are easy to verify.

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h}_j(\lambda^{(0)}) &= \frac{\partial h_j}{\partial a_j}(\lambda^{(0)}),\\ \frac{\partial \tilde{h}_j}{\partial \omega_k}(\lambda^{(0)}) &= \frac{\partial^2 h_j}{\partial a_j \partial \omega_k}(\lambda^{(0)}),\\ \frac{\partial l_j}{\partial a_j}(\lambda^{(0)}) &= V_j(\omega_j^{(0)}) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial a_j \partial \omega_k}(\lambda^{(0)}) &= \delta_{j,k} V_j'(\omega_j^{(0)}) = \delta_{j,k} \frac{(j\gamma)^2 \cos(\frac{\omega_j^{(0)}}{2})}{4 \sin^3(\frac{\omega_j^{(0)}}{2})} \neq 0, \\
\frac{\partial n_j}{\partial a_j}(\lambda^{(0)}) &= DW(0)[\partial_{a_j} u](e_j) = 0 \quad \text{(see (13.20))}\ , \\
\frac{\partial^2 n_j}{\partial a_j \partial \omega_k}(\lambda^{(0)}) &= DW(0)[\partial_{a_j}\partial_{\omega_k} u](e_j) + D^2 W(0)[\partial_{a_j} u, \partial_{\omega_k} u](e_j) = 0 \quad \text{by (13.20), (13.19)}\ .
\end{aligned}
$$

Claims (13.13) and (13.14) follow readily from these observations (see (13.18)). For later convenience we define

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Lambda &:= \operatorname{diag}(\Lambda_j), \quad \text{where} && (13.21) \\
\Lambda_j &= V_j'(\omega_j^{(0)}) = \tilde{V}_{j,+}(\omega_j^{(0)}) = \frac{(j\gamma)^2 \cos(\frac{\omega_j^{(0)}}{2})}{4 \sin^3(\frac{\omega_j^{(0)}}{2})} \geq d_V \quad \text{(cf. (2.15), proposition 19.1).} && (13.22)
\end{aligned}
$$

Then

$$
D_\omega \tilde{h}(\lambda^{(0)}) = \Lambda. \tag{13.23}
$$

13.3 Estimates on the functions $\tilde{h}$ and ω

Proposition 13.24 *(a) For all* $\lambda \in B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)})$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\partial^\beta \tilde{h}(\lambda)\right| &\leq D_{4,1} N_0^{E_\rho |\beta|_1} \quad \textit{for all } 0 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq B_1, && (13.25) \\
\left\| \left(D_\omega \tilde{h}\right)^{-1}(\lambda) \right\| &\leq \frac{2}{d_V}. && (13.26)
\end{aligned}
$$

(b) There exists an unique C^∞ *– function* $\omega : B_{\tilde{\rho}_1}(0) \to B_{\rho_1}(\omega^{(0)})$ *such that* $\tilde{h}(a, \omega(a)) = 0$ *for all* $a \in B_{\tilde{\rho}_1}(0)$*.*

(c)

$$
|\partial^\alpha \omega(a)| \leq \left(D_4 N_0^{B_1 E_\rho}\right)^{2|\alpha|_1 - 1} \quad \textit{for } 1 \leq |\alpha|_1 \leq B_1,\ |a| < \tilde{\rho}_1. \tag{13.27}
$$

Proof.

(a) It follows from (13.16), proposition 19.1 (a), and (13.2) that

$$
\left|\partial^\beta l(\lambda)\right| \leq D_V \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)}),\ 0 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq B_1 + 1. \tag{13.28}
$$

In order to estimate the derivatives on the function n (see (13.17)) we use proposition 24.1 and obtain for $|\beta|_1 \geq 1$

$$\partial_\lambda^\beta W(u(\lambda)) = \sum_{p=1}^{|\beta|_1} \frac{1}{p!} \sum_{\substack{\beta_1 + \ldots + \beta_p = \beta \\ \beta_i \neq 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq p}} \frac{\beta!}{\beta_1! \ldots \beta_p!} D^p W(u)[\partial^{\beta_1} u, \ldots, \partial^{\beta_p} u]. \tag{13.29}$$

Statement (d) of theorem 12.4 together with (4.35) yield

$$\left|\partial^\beta n(\lambda)\right| \leq D_{4,2} N_0^{E_\rho(|\beta|_1 - 1)} \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)}),\ 1 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq B_1 + 1. \tag{13.30}$$

Since $h = l + n$ (see (13.18)) claim (13.25) follows from (13.11), (13.28), (13.30) and (4.36). In order to prove (13.26) we first observe from (13.22) and (13.23) that

$$\left\| \left(D_\omega \tilde{h}\right)^{-1} (\lambda^{(0)}) \right\| \leq \frac{1}{d_V}, \tag{13.31}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the operator norm for linear maps $(\mathbb{R}^\nu, |\cdot|) \to (\mathbb{R}^\nu, |\cdot|)$. Using (13.1) and (13.25) we obtain

$$\left\| \left(D_\omega \tilde{h}\right)(\lambda) - \left(D_\omega \tilde{h}\right)(\lambda^{(0)}) \right\| \leq \frac{d_V}{2} \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in B_{\rho_1}(\lambda^{(0)}). \tag{13.32}$$

This proves (13.26).

(b) It suffices to show that for every $a \in B_{\tilde{\rho}_1}(0)$, the map

$$T_a : B_{\rho_1}(\omega^{(0)}) \to \mathbb{R}^\nu;\ \ T_a(\omega) = \omega - (D_\omega \tilde{h})^{-1}(\lambda^{(0)}) \tilde{h}(a, \omega), \tag{13.33}$$

defines a contraction on $B_{\rho_1}(\omega^{(0)})$. Indeed, by the Banach fixed point theorem this would imply that for every $a \in B_{\tilde{\rho}_1}(0)$ there exists an unique $\omega(a) \in B_{\rho_1}(\omega^{(0)})$ satisfying $\tilde{h}(a, \omega(a)) = 0$. The smoothness of the such defined function ω would then follow from a standard implicit function theorem (cf. (13.26)).

We will now show that T_a is a contraction on $B_{\rho_1}(\omega^{(0)})$ by verifying the estimates (13.34), (13.35) below for all $a \in B_{\tilde{\rho}_1}(0)$.

$$\begin{aligned} |T_a(\omega_2) - T_a(\omega_1)| &\leq \frac{1}{2}|\omega_2 - \omega_1|, && (13.34) \\ |T_a(\omega^{(0)}) - \omega^{(0)}| &\leq \frac{\rho_1}{2}. && (13.35) \end{aligned}$$

In order to verify (13.34), observe that

$$T_a(\omega_2) - T_a(\omega_1) = \Lambda^{-1} \left(\int_0^1 D_\omega \tilde{h}(\lambda^{(0)}) - D_\omega \tilde{h}(a, \omega_1 + t(\omega_2 - \omega_1)) dt \right) (\omega_2 - \omega_1),$$

and use (13.31), (13.32). Estimate (13.35) follows from (13.31), (13.13), (13.25) and (13.3).

(c) We will prove (13.27) by induction with respect to $k \equiv |\alpha|_1$.

$\underline{k = 1:}$ Implicit differentiation of $\tilde{h}(a, \omega(a)) = 0$ with respect to a_j gives

$$\partial_{a_j} \omega = -(D_\omega \tilde{h})^{-1} \partial_{a_j} \tilde{h}.$$

The claim follows from (13.26), (13.25) and $D_4 \geq \frac{2}{d_V} D_{4,1}$ (see (4.37)).

$\underline{k - 1 \to k:}$ Let $2 \leq k \leq B_1$ and let α be a multi-index with $|\alpha|_1 = k$. Using proposition 24.25 we obtain

$$0 = \frac{\partial^\alpha \tilde{h}}{\partial a^\alpha}(a, \omega(a)) = \left(D_\omega \tilde{h}\right) \partial^\alpha \omega + \sum_{s \in S_0(\alpha)} \left(\partial^{\gamma^{(s)}} \tilde{h}\right) \prod_{l=1}^{l^{(s)}} \partial^{\alpha_l^{(s)}} \omega_{i_l^{(s)}}, \tag{13.36}$$

where $\#S_0(\alpha) \leq (\nu + k)^k$, and for all $s \in S_0(\alpha)$ we have $|\gamma^{(s)}|_1 \leq k$, $1 \leq |\alpha_l^{(s)}|_1 \leq k - 1$, $\sum_{1 \leq l \leq l^{(s)}} |\alpha_l^{(s)}|_1 \leq k$. Define for $p \in \mathbb{N}$

$$C(p) := \left(D_4 N_0^{B_1 E_\rho}\right)^{2p-1}.$$

Using (13.36), (13.26), (13.25), the induction hypothesis, and (4.37) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial^\alpha \omega| &\leq \frac{2}{d_V} (\nu + k)^k D_{4,1} N_0^{E_\rho k} \left(\max_{s \in S_0(\alpha)} \prod_{l=1}^{l^{(s)}} C(|\alpha_l^{(s)}|_1) \right) \\
&\leq D_4 N_0^{B_1 E_\rho} \left(\max_{1 \leq p_i \leq k-1,\, p_1 + \ldots + p_l = k} C(p_1) \cdot \ldots C(p_l) \right) \\
&\leq D_4 N_0^{B_1 E_\rho} \left(D_4 N_0^{B_1 E_\rho}\right)^{2k-2} \\
&\leq C(k).
\end{aligned}$$

We have completed the proof of proposition 13.24 and have thus also shown theorem 13.4. □

14 Estimates on the measure of the set of resonant parameters

In this section we use the non-degeneracy assumption A4 to show that the function ω introduced in the previous section is not degenerate to second order. We use this fact to derive lower bounds on the measure of the set $\{a \in B_{\tilde{\rho}_1}(0) : (a, \omega(a)) \in \mathcal{N}^\infty\}$ (see lemma 14.57).

Estimates of lemma 4.54 used in section 14:

$$2(|\alpha_2|+1)\frac{80N_1^{\tau}}{d_V^2 s} \leq e^{\frac{15}{16}N_1^c} \tag{14.1}$$

$$128e^{2\nu}D_{\psi}(2)N^{2AE_\rho} \leq \frac{1}{80(|\alpha_2|+1)d_V}e^{\frac{1}{16}N^c} \quad \text{for all } N \geq N_1 \tag{14.2}$$

$$\frac{1}{16}N_1^c(N_1^{(A-1)c}-1) \geq \log 2 \tag{14.3}$$

$$4\sqrt{\nu}e^{-\frac{1}{16}N_1^c} \leq d_{min} \tag{14.4}$$

$$4\nu\sqrt{\nu}\left(D_4 N_0^{B_1E_\rho}\right)^5 \tilde{\rho}_1 \leq d_{min} \tag{14.5}$$

$$\nu\left(D_4 N_0^{B_1E_\rho}\right)^3 \sqrt{\rho_1} \leq 1 \tag{14.6}$$

$$B_1 \geq 8\nu^2 \tag{14.7}$$

$$\left(8\nu^{2.5}\right)^{4\nu^2}\left(D_4 N_0^{B_1E_\rho}\right)^{12\nu^2}\sqrt{\rho_1} \leq \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{d_{min}}{4}\right)^{4\nu^2} \tag{14.8}$$

$$D_P(9\nu^2)^{11\nu^2}[(5\nu^2)!](D_4\nu)^{16\nu^2}N_0^{16\nu^2B_1E_\rho+32\nu^2(B_0+\nu)E_M-A} \leq \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{d_{min}}{4}\right)^{4\nu^2} \tag{14.9}$$

$$4e^{-\frac{1}{16}N_1^c} \leq \tilde{d}_{min} \tag{14.10}$$

$$4\nu\left(D_4 N_0^{B_1E_\rho}\right)^5 \tilde{\rho}_1 \leq \tilde{d}_{min} \tag{14.11}$$

$$\nu^2\left(D_4 N_0^{B_1E_\rho}\right)^3 \tilde{\rho}_1 \leq 1 \tag{14.12}$$

$$4\nu\tilde{\rho}_1 \leq 1 \tag{14.13}$$

$$(\nu+2)B_1\sqrt{\frac{8(D_K+1)}{d_{min}}}5^\nu 2^{7\nu+1} \leq N_2 \tag{14.14}$$

$$\delta_{j+1}^{\frac{1}{B_1}}(\tilde{\rho}_j)^{\nu-1}N_{j+1}^{\nu+2}N_j^{4\nu}\delta_j^{-2} \leq 2^{-j}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\rho}_j^{\nu} \tag{14.15}$$

14.1 Second order Taylor expansion for the function ω.

Proposition 14.16 *Let ω be the function as defined in theorem 13.4. Then*

$$\text{(a)} \qquad \frac{\partial\omega}{\partial a_j}(0) = 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \nu, \tag{14.17}$$

$$\text{(b)} \qquad \left|\frac{\partial^2\omega}{\partial a_j \partial a_k}(0) - \delta_{j,k}\Omega^{(j)}\right| \leq e^{-\frac{1}{16}N_1^c} \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq j,k \leq \nu, \tag{14.18}$$

where

$$\Omega_l^{(j)} = \begin{cases} 6\Lambda_l^{-1}\left(2\alpha_2^2\frac{1}{V(\omega^{(0)})(2e_l)} - 3\alpha_3\right) & \text{if } l = j \\ 4\Lambda_l^{-1}\left(2\alpha_2^2\left(\frac{1}{V(\omega^{(0)})(e_l+e_j)} + \frac{1}{V(\omega^{(0)})(e_l-e_j)}\right) - 3\alpha_3\right) & \text{if } l \neq j \end{cases} \tag{14.19}$$

Proof. (a): Statement (c) of theorem 12.4 implies

$$\partial_{a_j} v(0,\omega) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \omega \in B_{\rho_1}(\omega^{(0)}). \tag{14.20}$$

Denote for $1 \leq j \leq \nu$

$$\tilde{e}_j := \delta_{e_j} + \delta_{-e_j} \in X_{1,c}. \tag{14.21}$$

The definition of $\varphi(a)$ (see (3.9)) and $u(a,\omega)$ (see (13.15)) implies

$$\partial_{a_j} u(0,\omega) = \tilde{e}_j \quad \text{for all } \omega \in B_{\rho_1}(\omega^{(0)}). \tag{14.22}$$

Using (13.11) and (13.16) – (13.20) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \tilde{h}_k}{\partial a_j}(0,\omega^{(0)}) &= \frac{\partial^2 h_k}{\partial a_k \partial a_j}(0,\omega^{(0)}) \\ &= \frac{\partial^2 n_k}{\partial a_k \partial a_j}(0,\omega^{(0)}) \\ &= (D^2 W)(0)[\partial_{a_k} u, \partial_{a_j} u](e_k) \\ &= 2\alpha_2 (\tilde{e}_k * \tilde{e}_j)(e_k) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{14.23}$$

Differentiating $\tilde{h}(a,\omega(a)) = 0$ with respect to a_j, $1 \leq j \leq \nu$, and using (13.23), (14.23) yields

$$\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial a_j}(0) = -\Lambda^{-1} \frac{\partial \tilde{h}}{\partial a_j}(0,\omega^{(0)}) = 0. \tag{14.24}$$

(b): Differentiating $\tilde{h}(a,\omega(a)) = 0$ with respect to a_j and a_k, $1 \leq j,k \leq \nu$ and using the already proven claim (a) together with (13.23) leads to

$$\frac{\partial^2 \omega}{\partial a_k \partial a_j}(0) = -\Lambda^{-1} \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{h}}{\partial a_k \partial a_j}(0,\omega^{(0)}). \tag{14.25}$$

It follows from (13.11), (13.16) – (13.20), (13.15) (3.9) and (14.22) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{h}_l}{\partial a_k \partial a_j}(0,\omega^{(0)}) &= \frac{\partial^3 n_l}{\partial a_l \partial a_k \partial a_j}(0,\omega^{(0)}) \\ &= \Big(DW(0)[\partial^3_{a_l,a_k,a_j} u] + (D^2W)(0)[\partial^2_{a_l,a_k} u, \partial_{a_j} u] + (D^2W)(0)[\partial^2_{a_l,a_j} u, \partial_{a_k} u] \\ &\quad + (D^2W)(0)[\partial^2_{a_k,a_j} u, \partial_{a_l} u] + (D^3W)(0)[\partial_{a_l} u, \partial_{a_k} u, \partial_{a_j} u] \Big)(e_l) \\ &= 2\alpha_2 \Big((\partial^2_{a_l,a_k} v) * \tilde{e}_j + (\partial^2_{a_l,a_j} v) * \tilde{e}_k + (\partial^2_{a_k,a_j} v) * \tilde{e}_l \Big)(e_l) + 6\alpha_3 \left(\tilde{e}_l * \tilde{e}_k * \tilde{e}_j\right)(e_l) \end{aligned} \tag{14.26}$$

Next we compute $(\partial^2_{a_k,a_j} v)(\lambda^{(0)})$. Induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})(1c)_{j=2}$ and Cauchy's integral formula give

$$\left\| \partial^\beta \mathcal{P}(v_2(\cdot),\cdot)(\lambda^{(0)}) \right\|_{1/4,c} \leq 2e^{-N_1^c} \quad \text{for } |\beta|_1 = 2. \tag{14.27}$$

Recalling induction statements $(\mathcal{IS})(1d)_{j=2}$ and $(\mathcal{IS})(1a)_{j=1}$ it is clear that $v_2(\lambda^{(0)}) = 0$ and also $(\partial_{a_j} v_2)(\lambda^{(0)}) = 0$ for $1 \le j \le \nu$. Hence,

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{P}(v_2(\cdot), \cdot)}{\partial a_k \partial a_j}(\lambda^{(0)}) = P\left[D(\omega^{(0)}) \frac{\partial^2 v_2}{\partial a_k \partial a_j}(\lambda^{(0)}) + 2\alpha_2 (\tilde{e}_k * \tilde{e}_j) \right].$$

Recall furthermore from (8.27) that

$$|V(\omega^{(0)})(m)| > \frac{d_V s}{2N_1^\tau} \quad \text{for } m \in B_{N_1}(0) \setminus (\mathcal{S} \cup \{0\}). \tag{14.28}$$

Employing induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})(1f)_{j=2}$, (14.1), (14.27) and (14.28) we arrive at

$$\left\| \frac{\partial^2 v_2}{\partial a_k \partial a_j}(\lambda^{(0)}) + 2\alpha_2 D^{-1}(\omega^{(0)}) P(\tilde{e}_k * \tilde{e}_j) \right\|_{1/4,c} \le \frac{1}{40(|\alpha_2|+1)d_V} e^{-\frac{1}{16}N_1^c}. \tag{14.29}$$

Induction statements $(\mathcal{IS})(1e)_{j\ge 2}$ together with (14.2) and (14.3) show that

$$\left\| \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial a_k \partial a_j}(\lambda^{(0)}) - \frac{\partial^2 v_2}{\partial a_k \partial a_j}(\lambda^{(0)}) \right\|_{1/4,c} \le \frac{1}{40(|\alpha_2|+1)d_V} e^{-\frac{1}{16}N_1^c}. \tag{14.30}$$

From (14.26), (14.29) and (14.30) we learn

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial^2_{a_k,a_j} \tilde{h}_l(\lambda^{(0)}) \quad &+ \quad 4\alpha_2^2 \left([D^{-1}P(\tilde{e}_l * \tilde{e}_k)] * \tilde{e}_j + [D^{-1}P(\tilde{e}_l * \tilde{e}_j)] * \tilde{e}_k + [D^{-1}P(\tilde{e}_k * \tilde{e}_j)] * \tilde{e}_l \right)(e_l) \\ &- \quad 6\alpha_3 (\tilde{e}_l * \tilde{e}_k * \tilde{e}_j)(e_l)| \le \frac{1}{d_V} e^{-\frac{1}{16}N_1^c}. \end{aligned} \tag{14.31}$$

Statement (b) of proposition 14.16 now follows from (13.22), (14.25) and (14.31) by an explicit calculation. □

14.2 Application of the non-degeneracy condition

Proposition 14.32 *For every $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus \{0\}$ there exists a $\sigma \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ such that for all $a_0 \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$*

$$\left| \left(\frac{d}{dt} \right)^2 < \omega(a_0 + te_\sigma), m > \right| \ge \frac{d_{min}}{2} |m|_2 \quad \textit{for all } t \textit{ with } |a_0 + e_\sigma t| < \tilde{\rho}_1. \tag{14.33}$$

Proof. Recall that the j-th row of the matrix Ω, defined in (2.18), is given by the vector $\Omega^{(j)}$ of proposition 14.16

$$\Omega_{j,l} = \Omega_l^{(j)} \quad \text{(cf. (4.9))} \tag{14.34}$$

Recall further the definition of d_{min} in (4.25),

$$d_{min} = \min_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^\nu : |\xi|_2 = 1} |\Omega \xi| > 0. \tag{14.35}$$

We infer from statement (c) of proposition 13.24 and (14.5) that

$$\left|\frac{\partial^2\omega}{\partial a_j^2}(a)-\frac{\partial^2\omega}{\partial a_j^2}(0)\right|_2\leq\frac{d_{min}}{4}\quad\text{for all } |a|<\tilde{\rho}_1,\ 1\leq j\leq\nu. \tag{14.36}$$

Observe further that condition (14.4) together with statement (b) of proposition 14.16 imply

$$\left|\frac{\partial^2\omega}{\partial a_j^2}(0)-\Omega^{(j)}\right|_2\leq\frac{d_{min}}{4}\quad\text{for all } 1\leq j\leq\nu. \tag{14.37}$$

Fix $m\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu\setminus\{0\}$. By (14.35) there exists $\sigma\in\{1,\dots,\nu\}$ with

$$\left|\left(\Omega\frac{m}{|m|_2}\right)_\sigma\right|\geq d_{min}. \tag{14.38}$$

Then for $|a_0+te_\sigma|<\tilde{\rho}_1$:

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)^2<\omega(a_0+te_\sigma),m>\right| &= \left|<(\partial_{a_\sigma}^2\omega)(a_0+te_\sigma),\frac{m}{|m|_2}>\right||m|_2\\ &\geq \left(\left|<\Omega^{(\sigma)},\frac{m}{|m|_2}>\right|-\frac{d_{min}}{2}\right)|m|_2\\ &= \left(\left|\left(\Omega\frac{m}{|m|_2}\right)_\sigma\right|-\frac{d_{min}}{2}\right)|m|_2\\ &\geq \frac{d_{min}}{2}|m|_2.\end{aligned}$$

□

We will now discuss an important consequence of proposition 14.32. To that end, fix $(p,\vartheta)\in\mathcal{POL}$ with

$$p(\theta,\lambda)=\theta^d+\sum_{k<d}b_k(\lambda)\theta^k, \tag{14.39}$$

Let $l\in\mathbb{Z}$, $m\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu\setminus\{0\}$. Choose $\sigma\in\{1,\dots,\nu\}$ as a function of m as described in proposition 14.32. Furthermore, we set

$$\begin{aligned}a(t) &:= a_0+e_\sigma t\quad\text{for } t \text{ with } |a(t)|<\tilde{\rho}_1, &(14.40)\\ \theta(t) &:= <\omega(a(t)),m>-\vartheta-2\pi l, &(14.41)\\ \lambda(t) &:= (a(t),\omega(a(t))), &(14.42)\\ f(t) &:= (\theta(t),\lambda(t)), &(14.43)\\ g(t) &:= p(f(t)). &(14.44)\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 14.45 *For $|m| \geq 2N_1$ the following estimate (14.46) holds for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $|a(t)| < \tilde{\rho}_1$ and $|\theta(t)| < 1$:*

$$\left| \left(\frac{d}{dt} \right)^{2d} g(t) \right| \geq (2d)! \left(\frac{d_{min}}{8} |m|_2 \right)^d . \tag{14.46}$$

Proof. According to proposition 24.20 (see also (24.19))

$$g^{[2d]} = \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha|_1 \leq 2d} p^{[\alpha]} \sum_{\substack{\delta^i \in \mathbb{N}^{\alpha_i} \\ \sum_i |\delta^i|_1 = 2d}} \prod_{i=1}^{2\nu+1} \prod_{j=1}^{\alpha_i} f_i^{[\delta^i_j]} \tag{14.47}$$

From (14.39) it is obvious that

$$p^{[\beta]}(\theta, \lambda) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \beta_1 > d, \\ 1 & \text{if } \beta = (d, 0), \\ 0 & \text{if } \beta_1 = d \text{ and } |\beta|_1 > d. \end{cases} \tag{14.48}$$

We use (14.48) to express the sum in (14.47)

$$\begin{aligned} g^{[2d]} &= p^{[(d,0)]} (\theta^{[2]})^d \\ &\quad + p^{[(d,0)]} \sum_{\substack{k_1 + \ldots + k_d = 2d, k_j \in \mathbb{N} \\ \exists i \in \{1, \ldots, d\} : k_i = 1}} \theta^{[k_1]} \cdots \theta^{[k_d]} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |\alpha|_1 \leq 2d \\ \alpha_1 < d}} p^{[\alpha]} \sum_{\substack{\delta^i \in \mathbb{N}^{\alpha_i} \\ \sum_i |\delta^i|_1 = 2d}} \prod_{i=1}^{2\nu+1} \prod_{j=1}^{\alpha_i} f_i^{[\delta^i_j]} \\ &= I + II + III. \end{aligned} \tag{14.49}$$

It follows from proposition 14.32, (14.40), (14.41), (14.48) and the choice of σ that

$$|I| \geq \left(\frac{d_{min}}{4} |m|_2 \right)^d . \tag{14.50}$$

In order to estimate the second term, we observe from propositions 14.16, 13.24 and from (14.6) that for $|\beta|_1 = 1$ and $|a| < \tilde{\rho}_1$

$$|\partial^\beta \omega(a)| = |\partial^\beta \omega(a) - \partial^\beta \omega(0)| \leq \nu \left(D_4 N_0^{B_1 E_\rho} \right)^3 \rho_1 \leq \sqrt{\rho_1}. \tag{14.51}$$

This implies immediately that

$$|\theta^{[1]}(t)| \leq \sqrt{\nu \rho_1} |m|_2. \tag{14.52}$$

On the other hand, it follows from (13.27), (14.7) that for $1 \leq k \leq 2d \leq 8\nu^2$ (see (4.51))

$$|\theta^{[k]}(t)| \leq \sqrt{\nu} \left(D_4 N_0^{B_1 E_\rho} \right)^{2k-1} |m|_2. \tag{14.53}$$

Expression II is a sum with less than $(2d)^d \leq (8\nu^2)^{4\nu^2}$ terms. Together with (14.8) we obtain

$$|II| \leq \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{d_{min}}{4} |m|_2 \right)^d. \tag{14.54}$$

Expression III can be written as a sum of products with at most $(2d+1)^{2\nu+1}(2d)^{2d} \leq (9\nu^2)^{11\nu^2}$ summands. Moreover, (4.51) implies

$$\left| p^{[\alpha]} \right| \leq D_P[(d+1)!] M_0^{32\nu^2(B_0+\nu)} \leq D_P (5\nu^2)! N_0^{32\nu^2(B_0+\nu)E_M}.$$

The assumption that $|m| \geq 2N_1$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=1}^{2\nu+1} \prod_{j=1}^{\alpha_i} f_i^{[\delta_j^i]} &\leq (\sqrt{\nu}|m|_2)^{d-1} (D_4 N_0^{B_1 E_\rho})^{4d} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2N_1} \nu^{2\nu^2} (D_4 N_0^{B_1 E_\rho})^{16\nu^2} |m|_2^d. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, using (14.9) we obtain

$$|III| \leq \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{d_{min}}{4} |m|_2 \right)^d. \tag{14.55}$$

□

14.3 The excision procedure

Recall from theorem 12.4 that we have solved the $\mathcal{P}$ – equation only for those values of the parameter λ which satisfy $\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^\infty$. The $\mathcal{Q}$ – equation is solved if λ is of the form $\lambda = (a, \omega(a))$. Combining both observations, we obtain a solution of our original equation (3.1) for those values of the parameter a which lie in the set

$$\mathcal{M}^\infty := \{a \in B_{\tilde{\rho}_1}(0) : (a, \omega(a)) \in \mathcal{N}^\infty\}. \tag{14.56}$$

The goal of this section is to show that the set of bad parameters for which we have no solutions is relatively small. More precisely, we will show that

Lemma 14.57 *$vol(B_{\tilde{\rho}_1}(0) \setminus \mathcal{M}^\infty) \leq \tilde{\kappa} \tilde{\rho}_1^\nu$.*

Recall that $\tilde{\kappa}$ was defined in (4.41). In order to prove lemma 14.57 we first recall the definition of $\mathcal{N}^\infty$ in (12.2) as the intersection of a sequence of nested sets. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^\infty &= \bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{M}^{(j)}, \quad \text{where} && (14.58) \\ \mathcal{M}^{(j)} &:= \{a \in B_{\tilde{\rho}_1}(0) : (a, \omega(a)) \in \overline{\mathcal{N}^{(j)}}\}. && (14.59) \end{aligned}$$

$\mathcal{M}^{(j)}$ is again a sequence of nested sets with $\mathcal{M}^{(1)} = B_{\tilde{\rho}_1}(0)$. Therefore lemma 14.57 is a consequence of the following proposition 14.60.

Proposition 14.60 *Let $j \geq 1$. Then vol$(\mathcal{M}^{(j)} \setminus \mathcal{M}^{(j+1)}) \leq 2^{-j}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\rho}_1^\nu$.*

Proof. (*Proposition 14.60*). Fix $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\tilde{\rho}_1/\tilde{\rho}_j \in \mathbb{N}$ (by definitions (4.13) – (4.15), (4.43) – (4.46) and the choice of n_0 in Lemma 4.54) there exists a cube decomposition of the set $B_{\tilde{\rho}_1}(0)$ into cubes of radius $\tilde{\rho}_j$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{B_{\tilde{\rho}_1}(0)} &= \bigcup_{y \in Y} \overline{B_{\tilde{\rho}_j}(a^{(y)})}, \\ B_{\tilde{\rho}_j}(a^{(y_1)}) \cap B_{\tilde{\rho}_j}(a^{(y_2)}) &= \emptyset \quad \text{for } y_1, y_2 \in Y,\ y_1 \neq y_2. \end{aligned}$$

To prove proposition 14.60 it suffices to show that for each $y \in Y$

$$\mathrm{vol}((\mathcal{M}^{(j)} \setminus \mathcal{M}^{(j+1)}) \cap B_{\tilde{\rho}_j}(a^{(y)})) \leq 2^{-j}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\rho}_j^\nu. \tag{14.61}$$

Fix $y \in Y$. Define

$$K_y := \{\tilde{k} \in K^{(j+0.5)} : (a, \omega(a)) \in B_{\tilde{\rho}_j}(\lambda_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+0.5)}) \text{ for some } a \in B_{\tilde{\rho}_j}(a^{(y)})\}. \tag{14.62}$$

In view of induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})(2b)_{j+1}$ the relation

$$a \in (\mathcal{M}^{(j)} \setminus \mathcal{M}^{(j+1)}) \cap B_{\tilde{\rho}_j}(a^{(y)}) \tag{14.63}$$

implies that there exist $\tilde{k} \in K_y$, $(p, \vartheta) \in \mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that the following holds

$$\begin{aligned} (a, \omega(a)) &\in \overline{B_{\tilde{\rho}_j}(\lambda_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+0.5)})}, && (14.64) \\ 2N_j < |m| &\leq 2N_{j+1}, && (14.65) \\ |< \omega(a), m > -\vartheta - 2\pi l| &< 1, && (14.66) \\ |p(< \omega(a), m > -\vartheta - 2\pi l, (a, \omega(a)))| &< (D_K + 1)\delta_{j+1}. && (14.67) \end{aligned}$$

Fix $\tilde{k} \in K_y$, $(p, \vartheta) \in \mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and set

$$\mathcal{B} := \{a \in B_{\tilde{\rho}_j}(a^{(y)}) : (14.64) - (14.67) \text{ are satisfied } \}. \tag{14.68}$$

In order to estimate the (Lebesgue-) measure of the set $\mathcal{B}$ we use Fubini's theorem. Choose $\sigma \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ as a function of m according to proposition 14.32. Denote by H the hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^\nu$ which contains the point $a^{(y)}$ and which is perpendicular to the vector e_σ. For $a_0 \in H \cap B_{\tilde{\rho}_j}(a^{(y)})$ we define

$$\mathcal{B}_{a_0} := \{t \in \mathbb{R} : a_0 + te_\sigma \in \mathcal{B}\}. \tag{14.69}$$

According to the notation we introduced in (14.40) – (14.44) let

$$\begin{aligned} a(t) &= a_0 + te_\sigma, \\ \theta(t) &= <\omega(a(t)), m> -\vartheta - 2\pi l. \end{aligned}$$

Recall from proposition 14.32 that θ'' does not change sign. This implies immediately that all values of t for which condition (14.66) is satisfied form a set which is the union of at most two intervals (including the possibility that the set is empty). Observe that proposition 14.16(b), proposition 13.24(c) together with assumption A4, (4.26), (14.10) and (14.11) imply

$$\left| \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \omega_l(a(t)) \right| \geq \frac{\tilde{d}_{min}}{2}$$

for all $1 \leq l \leq \nu$ and $|a(t)| \leq \tilde{\rho}_1$. Hence the set of those values of t for which condition (14.64) is satisfied is the union of at most $\nu + 1$ intervals (including the possibility of the empty set). Consequently, the values of t for which both conditions (14.64) and (14.66) are satisfied form a set which is the union of at most $\nu + 2$ intervals. In each of these intervals we can apply the excision lemma 22.1 and proposition 14.45 to estimate the measure of the set $\mathcal{B}_{a_0}$. Using in addition that the degree d of the polynomial p is bounded by $4\nu^2 = B_1/2$ (see (4.51), (4.20)) we obtain

$$\text{vol}(\mathcal{B}_{a_0}) \leq (\nu + 2) 2B_1 \sqrt{\frac{8(D_K + 1)}{d_{min}|m|_2}} \delta_{j+1}^{\frac{1}{B_1}}. \tag{14.70}$$

To obtain an estimate on $\mathcal{B}$ we integrate (14.70) with respect to a_0 over the set $H \cap B_{\tilde{\rho}_j}(a^{(y)})$, yielding

$$\text{vol}(\mathcal{B}) \leq (\nu + 2) 2B_1 \sqrt{\frac{8(D_K + 1)}{d_{min}}} \delta_{j+1}^{\frac{1}{B_1}} (2\tilde{\rho}_j)^{\nu - 1}. \tag{14.71}$$

Recall that we have fixed $\tilde{k} \in K_y$, $(p, \vartheta) \in \mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ for the definition of the set $\mathcal{B}$. In order to complete the proof we need to determine for how many values of $\tilde{k}$, (p, ϑ), m and l the corresponding set $\mathcal{B}$ is not empty.

- $\#m$: condition (14.65) implies that the number of possible lattice points is bounded by $(5N_{j+1})^\nu$.
- $\#(p, \vartheta)$: Recall from induction statement $(\mathcal{IS})(2c)_{j+1}$ that the set $\mathcal{POL}_{\tilde{k}}^{(j+1)}$ has at most $2(2N_j)^{4\nu}\delta_j^{-2}$ elements.
- $\#\tilde{k}$: Using proposition 14.16(a), proposition 13.24(c) and (14.12) we learn that

  $$\left|\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial a_l}(a)\right| \leq \frac{1}{\nu} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq l \leq \nu,\ |a| \leq \tilde{\rho}_1. \tag{14.72}$$

  This implies that $|\omega(a) - \omega(a^{(y)})| \leq |a - a^{(y)}|$ which in turn shows that the set K_y contains at most $2^{2\nu}$ elements.
- $\#l$: It follows from (14.72) that for a_1, $a_2 \in B_{\tilde{\rho}_j}(a^{(y)})$ and $|m| \leq 2N_{j+1}$ we have

  $$| < \omega(a_1), m > - < \omega(a_2), m > | \leq 4\nu N_{j+1}\tilde{\rho}_j.$$

  Using (14.13) we conclude that the number of integers l, for which (14.66) is satisfied for some fixed ϑ and $|m| \leq 2N_{j+1}$ is bounded above by

  $$\frac{N_{j+1} + 2}{2\pi} + 1 \leq N_{j+1}.$$

These estimates, together with (14.71), (14.14) and (14.15) prove (14.61), completing the proof of proposition 14.60. □

15 Proof of the main theorem 2.19

Our main result essentially follows from theorems 12.4, 13.4 and lemma 14.57 via proposition 5.22.

Estimates of lemma 4.54 used in section 15:

$$D_3 N_0^{\tau+1}\tilde{\rho}_1^2 + 2\nu e D_N \tilde{\rho}_1 < r_{F,b} \tag{15.1}$$

$$\nu\left(D_4 N_0^{B_1 E_\rho}\right)^3 \tilde{\rho}_1 < 1 \tag{15.2}$$

$$\sin\frac{\omega_1^{(0)} - \nu\tilde{\rho}_1}{2} > \tilde{\rho}_1 \tag{15.3}$$

Notation 15.4 *For every* $z \in \mathbb{C}^\nu$ *we denote its polar coordinates by* $(a, \zeta) \in (\mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\})^\nu \times [0, 2\pi)^\nu$ *which satisfy*

$$(z_1, \dots, z_\nu) = (a_1 e^{i\zeta_1}, \dots, a_\nu e^{i\zeta_\nu}).$$

Set

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho &:= \tilde{\rho}_1, && (15.5)\\
\mathcal{Z} &:= \{z \in \mathbb{C}^\nu : a \in \mathcal{M}^\infty\}, && (15.6)\\
\omega & \quad\text{as defined in theorem 13.4 ,} && (15.7)\\
u(z)(m) &:= (\ \varphi(a)(m) + v(a, \omega(a))(m)\ ) e^{i<\zeta,m>}, && (15.8)\\
\chi(\xi, z) &:= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus \{0\}} \frac{u(z)(m)}{-2i \sin \frac{<\omega(a),m>}{2}} e^{i<m,\xi>}. && (15.9)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the ambiguity in the definition of the polar coordinates for $z = 0$ plays no role in the definition (15.8) since $\varphi(0) + v(\lambda^{(0)}) = 0$. We show now that the functions x_n as defined through (2.20) define a solution of system (2.1). In order to prove this we fix $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and use proposition 5.22 with $s_0 := sd_{\tau,c}$, $\omega := \omega(a)$ and $u := u(z)$. We need to verify conditions (5.23) – (5.27).

- (5.23): follows from theorem 12.4(c), (3.9), and (15.1).

- (5.24): follows from theorem 12.4(e) and (3.9).

- (5.25): Using theorem 12.4(f) and (3.9) we see that

  $$u(-m) = u(z)(-m) = u(a)(-m)e^{i<\zeta,-m>} = \overline{u(a)(m)e^{i<\zeta,m>}} = \overline{u(z)(m)} = \overline{u(m)}.$$

- (5.26): Recall that $a \in \mathcal{M}^\infty$ implies by definition (14.56) that $(a, \omega(a)) \in \mathcal{N}^\infty$ and the claim follows from theorem 12.4(h) and the definition of s_0 given above.

- (5.27): Using (5.26) condition (5.27) is equivalent to satisfying $D(\omega)u(m) + W(u)(m) = 0$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus \{0\}$. Since $(a, \omega(a)) \in \mathcal{N}^\infty$ we recall from theorem 12.4(b) and theorem 13.4 that

  $$D(\omega)u(a)(m) + W(u(a))(m) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \ m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus \{0\}.$$

  Observe that $u(z)(m) = u(a)(m)e^{i<\zeta,m>}$. It follows from the definition of W and property (5.8) of convolutions that $W(u(z))(m) = W(u(a))(m)e^{i<\zeta,m>}$. This proves (5.27).

We have seen that for every $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ the functions x_n defined through (2.20) and (15.9) solve system (2.1) and are of type (2.2).

It remains to prove assertions (2.21) – (2.24). Claim (2.21) follows from the definition of $\tilde{\kappa}$ in (4.41), from lemma 14.57, and from proposition 4.42.

In order to verify (2.22) we first observe that proposition 13.24(c) together with proposition 14.16(a) and (15.2) imply that $|\partial_{a_j}\omega(a)| < 1$ for all $|a| < \rho$. Using in addition (15.3) we conclude that the function

$$a_j \mapsto \frac{a_j}{\sin\frac{\omega_j(a)}{2}} \tag{15.10}$$

is strictly increasing for all $1 \leq j \leq \nu$. Suppose now that $\chi(\cdot, z) = \chi(\cdot, \tilde{z})$. Evaluating the e_j Fourier coefficients we obtain from theorem 12.4(e) and (3.9)

$$\frac{z_j}{2i\sin\frac{\omega_j(a)}{2}} = \frac{\tilde{z}_j}{2i\sin\frac{\omega_j(\tilde{a})}{2}}$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq \nu$. Comparing moduli and arguments of these complex numbers and using the strict monotonicity of the functions defined in (15.10) we conclude that $a_j = \tilde{a}_j$, $1 \leq j \leq \nu$, and therefore $z = \tilde{z}$.

Claim (2.23) follows immediately from proposition 14.16 (a). and proposition 13.24 (c)

Finally, claim (2.24) is a consequence of statements (c) and (h) of theorem 12.4 and from

$$\frac{z_j}{-2i\sin\frac{\omega_j(a)}{2}} - z_j' = \frac{z_j}{-2i\sin\frac{\omega_j(a)}{2}} - \frac{z_j}{-2i\sin\frac{\omega_j^{(0)}}{2}} = \mathcal{O}(|\omega(a) - \omega^{(0)}|) = \mathcal{O}(|z|^2) \quad \text{by (2.23).}$$

The proof of theorem 2.19 is complete.

Appendix

16 The assumptions of theorem 2.19

In this section we study the assumptions of our main result which were formulated in section 2.2. The first lemma shows that the entries of the matrix Ω as given in (2.18) are well defined if assumptions A1 and A2 are satisfied. Then we prove that for a generic set of force laws and sufficiently low frequencies we may satisfy assumptions A1 – A4 by varying the averaged lattice spacing b. This result is formulated in theorem 16.32. A description of the exceptional set of force laws which is not covered by theorem 16.32 is given in lemma 16.31.

Lemma 16.1 *Let $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be given such that assumptions A1 and A2 of section 2.2 are satisfied. Let ν, $\omega^{(0)}$, Λ_j and $V(\omega)(m)$ be defined as in (2.11) – (2.13), (2.15) – (2.16). Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_j &\in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \quad \textit{for } 1 \le j \le \nu, && (16.2)\\ V(\omega^{(0)})(e_j + e_l) &\in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \quad \textit{for } 1 \le j, l \le \nu, && (16.3)\\ V(\omega^{(0)})(e_j - e_l) &\in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \quad \textit{for } 1 \le j \ne l \le \nu. && (16.4) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Statement (16.2) is obvious from $\omega_j^{(0)}/2 \in (0, \pi/2)$ for $1 \le j \le \nu$. Furthermore, for $1 \le j, l \le \nu$ we observe that $\frac{1}{2} < \omega^{(0)}, e_j + e_l > \in (0, \pi)$ and $V(\omega^{(0)})(e_j + e_l) \in \mathbb{R}$. To see $V(\omega^{(0)})(e_j + e_l) \ne 0$ we use the inequality

$$\sin(\alpha + \beta) < \sin\alpha + \sin\beta \quad \text{for } \alpha, \beta \in (0, \pi/2). \tag{16.5}$$

Definition (2.12) implies

$$j\gamma = 2\sqrt{F'(-b)} \sin\frac{\omega_j^{(0)}}{2}, \quad l\gamma = 2\sqrt{F'(-b)} \sin\frac{\omega_l^{(0)}}{2}. \tag{16.6}$$

Adding the two equations of (16.6) and using (16.5) yields

$$(l + j)\gamma > 2\sqrt{F'(-b)} \sin\frac{\omega_j^{(0)} + \omega_l^{(0)}}{2} > 0. \tag{16.7}$$

This implies $V(\omega^{(0)})(e_j + e_l) < 0$ by definition (2.16).

In order to prove (16.4), let $1 \leq j \neq l \leq \nu$. Since $V(\omega)(m) = V(\omega)(-m)$ it suffices to consider the case $j > l$. Again, $V(\omega^{(0)})(e_j - e_l) \in \mathbb{R}$ follows from $\frac{1}{2} < \omega^{(0)}, e_j - e_l > \in (0, \pi)$. Furthermore, (16.5) and (16.6) yield

$$0 < (j-l)\gamma \;=\; 2\sqrt{F'(-b)}\left(\sin\frac{\omega_j^{(0)}}{2} - \sin\frac{\omega_l^{(0)}}{2}\right) < 2\sqrt{F'(-b)}\sin\frac{\omega_j^{(0)} - \omega_l^{(0)}}{2}. \qquad (16.8)$$

Thus $V(\omega^{(0)})(e_j - e_l) > 0$. □

Lemma 16.9 *Let $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$, $\nu \geq 2$. Define*

$$\eta(x) := (\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_\nu)(x), \quad \eta_j(x) := 2\arcsin(jx) \quad \text{for } |x| < 1/\nu.$$

For every $x_0 \in B_{1/\nu}(0)$ there exist positive constants r, τ and a (Lebesgue –) zero set $N \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that for every $x \in B_r(x_0) \setminus N$ there exists a real number $s > 0$ with

$$\mathit{dist}(< m, \eta(x) >, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) > \frac{s}{|m|^\tau} \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus \{0\}. \qquad (16.10)$$

Proof. The proof proceeds in four steps:

Step 1:

Claim 1: *The functions $\eta_1', \ldots, \eta_\nu'$ are linearly independent.*

Proof of claim 1: Denote by $\eta_j^{(k)} := (d/dx)^k \eta_j$ the k-th derivative of η_j. We define the $\nu \times \nu$ matrix

$$M := \left(\eta_j^{(2k-1)}(0)\right)_{1 \leq j,k \leq \nu}. \qquad (16.11)$$

Note that $\eta_j^{(2k-1)}(0) = j^{2k-1}\eta_1^{(2k-1)}(0)$ and therefore

$$\det M \;=\; \left(\prod_{k=1}^{\nu} \eta_1^{(2k-1)}(0)\right) \det \tilde{M}, \quad \text{where} \qquad (16.12)$$
$$\tilde{M} := \left(j^{2k-1}\right)_{1 \leq j,k \leq \nu}.$$

Expanding

$$\arcsin'(x) = (1-x^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \sum_{j \geq 0} \left(\begin{array}{c} -\frac{1}{2} \\ j \end{array}\right)(-x^2)^j,$$

it is clear that $\eta_1^{(2k-1)}(0) \neq 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In order to prove $\det M \neq 0$ it suffices to verify that $\det \tilde{M} \neq 0$. Suppose $\det \tilde{M} = 0$. Then the columns of $\tilde{M}$ are linearly dependent and consequently there exists a nonzero vector $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ with $\sum_{k=1}^{\nu} \alpha_k j^{2k-1} = 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq \nu$. Hence the nonzero polynomial $p(z) := \sum_{k=1}^{\nu} \alpha_k z^{2k-1}$ has 2ν zeros $\pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots, \pm \nu$ yielding a contradiction. We have thus established that $\det M \neq 0$. This implies that the functions η'_j are linearly independent. Indeed, linear dependence of the vectors η'_j would translate to linear dependence of the columns of M.

Step 2:

Claim 2: *There exist positive constants* r, δ *and* K, *such that for every* $m \in \mathbb{Z}^{\nu} \setminus \{0\}$ *there exists* $k_m \in \mathbb{N}$, $k_m \leq K$ *satisfying*

$$\left| < \frac{m}{|m|_2}, \eta^{(k_m)}(x) > \right| > k_m! \delta^{k_m} \quad \textit{for all } x \in B_r(x_0) \tag{16.13}$$

and $|x_0| + r < 1/\nu$.

Proof of claim 2: Let $\xi \in S^{\nu-1}$, where $S^{\nu-1} = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu} : |\xi|_2 = 1\}$ denotes the Euclidean unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^{\nu}$. The function $f_{\xi}(x) :=< \xi, \eta'(x) >$ is analytic and does not vanish identically on $B_{1/\nu}(0)$ by claim 1. Hence there exists a $k_{\xi} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $< \xi, \eta^{(k_{\xi})}(x_0) > \neq 0$. By continuity we find positive constants r_{ξ}, δ_{ξ} and a open neighborhood $\xi \in V_{\xi} \subset S^{\nu-1}$ such that

$$\left| < \zeta, \eta^{(k_{\xi})}(x) > \right| > k_{\xi}! \delta_{\xi}^{k_{\xi}} \quad \text{for all } \zeta \in V_{\xi},\ x \in B_{r_{\xi}}(x_0). \tag{16.14}$$

The sets $(V_{\xi})_{\xi \in S^{\nu-1}}$ form an open cover of the unit sphere. Claim 2 now follows from (16.14) and from the compactness of $S^{\nu-1}$.

Step 3:

Claim 3: *Let* r, K *be as determined in claim 2. For* $0 < t \leq 1$ *we define the sets*

$$\mathcal{B}_t := \left\{ x \in B_r(x_0) : \exists m \in \mathbb{Z}^{\nu} \setminus \{0\} \quad \textit{with} \quad \textit{dist}(< m, \eta(x) >, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) < t|m|_2^{-K(\nu+1)} \right\}. \tag{16.15}$$

There exists a constant $C > 0$ *such that*

$$\lambda(\mathcal{B}_t) \leq C t^{1/K} \quad \textit{for all } \ 0 < t \leq 1,$$

where λ *denotes the Lebesgue measure on* $\mathbb{R}$.

Proof of claim 3: Denote by $C_1 := \sup_{x \in B_r(x_0)} |\eta'(x)|_2$ which is finite since $|x_0| + r < 1/\nu$ (see claim 2). Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}^{\nu} \setminus \{0\}$ and set $g_m(x) :=< m, \eta(x) >$ for $x \in B_r(x_0)$. From claim 2 it follows that

$$\left| g_m^{(k_m)}(x) \right| > k_m! \delta^{k_m} |m|_2. \tag{16.16}$$

According to lemma 22.1 this implies for $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and

$$\mathcal{B}_{t,m,l} := \left\{ x \in B_r(x_0) : |g_m(x) - 2\pi l| < t|m|_2^{-K(\nu+1)} \right\}$$

the following estimate

$$\lambda\left(\mathcal{B}_{t,m,l}\right) \leq 2k_m \delta^{-1} |m|_2^{-\frac{1}{k_m}} \left(t|m|_2^{-K(\nu+1)}\right)^{\frac{1}{k_m}} \leq 2K \frac{t^{\frac{1}{K}}}{\delta |m|_2^{\nu+1+\frac{1}{K}}}.$$

It follows from the definition of C_1 above that the range $\{g_m(x) : x \in B_r(x_0)\}$ is an interval of length $\leq 2rC_1|m|_2$. This implies that the number of integers $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ for which $\mathcal{B}_{t,m,l}$ is not the empty set is bounded above by $1 + (2rC_1|m|_2 + 2t)/(2\pi)$. The Lebesgue measure of the set

$$\mathcal{B}_{t,m} := \left\{ x \in B_r(x_0) : \ \operatorname{dist}(g_m(x), 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) < t|m|_2^{-K(\nu+1)} \right\}.$$

is therefore bounded by

$$\lambda\left(\mathcal{B}_{t,m}\right) \leq (2rC_1 + 3)|m|_2 \frac{2K}{\delta} t^{\frac{1}{K}} |m|_2^{-(\nu+1+\frac{1}{K})}. \tag{16.17}$$

Since $\mathcal{B}_t = \bigcup_{m \neq 0} \mathcal{B}_{t,m}$ claim 3 is an immediate consequence of (16.17).

Step 4:

Proof of the lemma. Let r, K be defined as in claim 2 and set $\tau := K(\nu + 1)$. Furthermore we define $N := \bigcap_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{B}_{1/n}$ as intersection of countably many nested sets. It follows from claim 3 that $\lambda(N) = 0$. On the other hand for $x \in B_r(x_0) \setminus N$ there exists an integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x \in B_r(x_0) \setminus \mathcal{B}_{1/n}$. By definition (16.15) it is clear that (16.10) is satisfied for $s = 1/(2n)$. □

In order to investigate the non-degeneracy condition, i.e. assumption A4, we introduce some more notation. For $\nu \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$ let $\Omega_1^{(\nu)}$ denote the $\nu \times \nu$ matrix

$$(\Omega_1^{(\nu)})_{i,j} := \delta_{i,j} + 2. \tag{16.18}$$

It follows from (2.11) – (2.13), (2.16), (2.18), and lemma 16.1 that there exists a real analytic two parameter family of symmetric $\nu \times \nu$ matrices $\Omega_2^{(\nu)}(t, \gamma)$ defined on

$$\mathcal{D}_2^{(\nu)} := \{(t, \gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : t > 0, \ \ \nu\gamma < 2\sqrt{t} < (\nu + 1)\gamma\}, \tag{16.19}$$

such that $\Omega^{(\nu)}$ (see (2.18)) can be written in the form

$$\Omega^{(\nu)} = \left(F''(-b)^2 \Omega_2^{(\nu)}(F'(-b), \gamma) - F'''(-b)\Omega_1^{(\nu)} \right) \cdot \ \operatorname{diag}(\Lambda_l^{-1}). \tag{16.20}$$

Set

$$\mathcal{D}_3^{(\nu)} := \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{D}_2^{(\nu)}, \tag{16.21}$$

For $1 \leq j, l \leq \nu$ define real analytic functions

$$G_{j,l}^{(\nu)} : \mathcal{D}_3^{(\nu)} \to \mathbb{R}; \quad G_{j,l}^{(\nu)}(u, t, \gamma) := \frac{u^2}{2 + \delta_{j,l}} \left(\Omega_2^{(\nu)}(t, \gamma)\right)_{j,l}. \tag{16.22}$$

Observe that

$$\Omega_{j,l}^{(\nu)} = 0 \Leftrightarrow F'''(-b) = G_{j,l}^{(\nu)}(F''(-b), F'(-b), \gamma). \tag{16.23}$$

Next we turn to the condition $\det \Omega^{(\nu)} \neq 0$ in assumption A4.

It is easy to see that $\det \Omega_1^{(\nu)} = 2\nu + 1$ (use for example that $\Omega_1^{(\nu)}$ is of the form identity + rank 1 matrix). Hence $\Omega_1^{(\nu)}$ is invertible. We define for $(u, t, \gamma) \in \mathcal{D}_3^{(\nu)}$

$$\Gamma^{(\nu)}(u, t, \gamma) := u^2 \Omega_2^{(\nu)}(t, \gamma) \left(\Omega_1^{(\nu)}\right)^{-1}, \tag{16.24}$$

which defines a real analytic family of symmetric $\nu \times \nu$ matrices. Hence there exist real analytic functions $\lambda_j^{(\nu)} : \mathcal{D}_3^{(\nu)} \to \mathbb{R}$, $1 \leq j \leq \nu$, not necessarily pairwise distinct, which denote the eigenvalues of $\Gamma^{(\nu)}$ (see [42]). Observe that (16.20) and (16.24) imply

$$\det \Omega^{(\nu)} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \det \left(\Gamma^{(\nu)}(F''(-b), F'(-b), \gamma) - F'''(-b)\right) = 0 \tag{16.25}$$

and hence

$$\det \Omega^{(\nu)} = 0 \Leftrightarrow F'''(-b) \in \{\lambda_j^{(\nu)}(F''(-b), F'(-b), \gamma) : 1 \leq j \leq \nu\}. \tag{16.26}$$

Since it is our goal to avoid that either an entry of $\Omega^{(\nu)}$ vanishes or that $\det \Omega^{(\nu)}$ vanishes we exclude those analytic force laws F which, for some $1 \leq j, l \leq \nu$, satisfy one of the differential equations

$$\begin{aligned} F'''(-b) &= G_{j,l}^{(\nu)}(F''(-b), F'(-b), \gamma), && (16.27) \\ F'''(-b) &= \lambda_j^{(\nu)}(F''(-b), F'(-b), \gamma), && (16.28) \end{aligned}$$

in a neighborhood of $-b_0$. Furthermore, for reasons which will become clear in the proof of theorem 16.32 below we also exclude the case F' is constant. Note that in this case F is linear and the quasi-periodic wave solutions of (2.1) are easily constructed (see section 2.1). We define for $b_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $r_0 > 0$

$$\mathcal{A}_{b_0, r_0} := \left\{F : B_{r_0}(-b_0) \to \mathbb{R} \text{ real analytic } : F'(-b_0) > 0\right\}. \tag{16.29}$$

For $\nu \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$ we say that F is ν – degenerate, if there exists $\gamma > 0$ with

$$\nu\gamma < 2\sqrt{F'(-b_0)} < (\nu+1)\gamma$$

and F satisfies one of the differential equations (16.27), (16.28) in some neighborhood of $-b_0$. Set

$$\mathcal{F}^{(\nu)}_{b_0,r_0} := \mathcal{A}_{b_0,r_0} \setminus (\{F \in \mathcal{A}_{b_0,r_0} : F \text{ linear }\} \cup \{F \in \mathcal{A}_{b_0,r_0} : F \text{ is } \nu - \text{degenerate}\}) \tag{16.30}$$

Lemma 16.31 *Let $\nu \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$, $b_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and $r_0 > 0$.*

(a) The set $\mathcal{F}^{(\nu)}_{b_0,r_0}$ is an open and dense subset of $\mathcal{A}_{b_0,r_0}$ with respect to the topology generated by the sup-norm.

(b) The exceptional set $\mathcal{A}_{b_0,r_0} \setminus \mathcal{F}^{(\nu)}_{b_0,r_0}$ consists of all linear functions in $\mathcal{A}_{b_0,r_0}$ together with a finite collection of four-parameter families of functions, each of which can be parameterized by $F(-b_0)$, $F'(-b_0)$, $F''(-b_0)$ and γ.

Proof. The proof of (b) follows from definition (16.30). Claim (a) is a consequence of (b). □

We now state the main result of this section. It makes the notion precise that *assumptions A1 – A4 are generically satisfied.*

Theorem 16.32 *Let $\nu \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$, $b_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $r_0 > 0$, $F \in \mathcal{F}^{(\nu)}_{b_0,r_0}$, and $\gamma > 0$ such that*

$$\nu\gamma < 2\sqrt{F'(-b_0)} < (\nu+1)\gamma. \tag{16.33}$$

Then there exist $\beta > 0$ and a (Lebesgue –) zero set $M \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that assumptions A1 – A4 of section 2.2 are satisfied for all $b \in B_\beta(b_0) \setminus M$. The set $\mathcal{F}^{(\nu)}_{b_0,r_0}$ is an open and dense subset of $\mathcal{A}_{b_0,r_0}$ with respect to the topology generated by the sup-norm.

Proof. Assumptions A1 and A2 are satisfied for F, b_0, γ by the hypothesis of theorem 16.32. Clearly there exists a $\beta_1 > 0$ such that

$$\nu\gamma < 2\sqrt{F'(-b)} < (\nu+1)\gamma \tag{16.34}$$

for all $b \in B_{\beta_1}(b_0)$ and therefore assumptions A1 and A2 are satisfied for F, b, γ if $b \in B_{\beta_1}(b_0)$.

To verify the diophantine condition (assumption A3) set

$$G(b) := \frac{\gamma}{2\sqrt{F'(-b)}} \quad \text{for } b \in B_{\beta_1}(b_0) \tag{16.35}$$

and define $x_0 := G(b_0) \in B_{1/\nu}(0)$ (by (16.33)). We apply lemma 16.9 and obtain positive constants r, τ and a zero-set N such that for every $x \in B_r(x_0) \setminus N$ there exists a constant $s > 0$ such that (16.10) holds. Choose $0 < \beta \leq \beta_1$ such that $G(B_\beta(b_0)) \subset B_r(x_0)$ and define

$$M_1 := \{b \in B_\beta(b_0) : G(b) \in N\}. \tag{16.36}$$

By (16.34) and the definition of $\mathcal{F}^{(\nu)}_{b_0,r_0}$ (in (16.30)) we observe that G is an analytic, non constant function on $B_\beta(b_0)$. Thus M_1 is again a set of zero Lebesgue measure. For all $b \in B_\beta(b_0) \setminus M_1$ we have $G(b) \in B_r(x_0) \setminus N$ and hence there exists a constant $s > 0$ such that (16.10) holds. Assumption A3 is satisfied for all $b \in B_\beta(b_0) \setminus M_1$.

In order to investigate assumption A4 recall that the choice of β implies that (16.34) is true for all $b \in B_\beta(b_0)$. This implies that $(F'(-b), \gamma) \in \mathcal{D}^{(\nu)}_2$ for all $b \in B_\beta(b_0)$. Since F is not ν – degenerate and F, $\lambda^{(\nu)}_j$, $G^{(\nu)}_{j,l}$ $1 \leq j, l \leq \nu$ are real analytic functions the set

$$\begin{aligned} M_2 := \big\{ b \in B_\beta(b_0) : F'''(-b) \ &\in\ \{\lambda^{(\nu)}_j(F''(-b), F'(-b), \gamma) : 1 \leq j \leq \nu\} \\ &\cup\ \{G^{(\nu)}_{j,l}(F''(-b), F'(-b), \gamma) : 1 \leq j, l \leq \nu\} \big\} \end{aligned}$$

consists of at most countably many points. By (16.26) and (16.23) it is clear that no entry of $\Omega^{(\nu)}$ vanishes and that $\det \Omega^{(\nu)} \neq 0$ for $b \in B_\beta(b_0) \setminus M_2$.

Set $M := M_1 \cup M_2$. Assumptions A1 – A4 hold for all $b \in B_\beta(b_0) \setminus M$. The genericity of the set $\mathcal{F}_{b_0}$ has already been proved in lemma 16.31. □

17 Weight functions

In this section we prove proposition 17.2 which implies the useful property (5.18) for the families of weight functions introduced in 5.15. The proof of proposition 17.2 can be found in [44] and we repeat it here for the sake of completeness.

Let $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < x \leq 1$. Recall that $|\cdot|$ denotes the maximum norm on $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$. We define

$$D_{\nu,x} := \begin{cases} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu, \sigma \geq 1/4} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu} \frac{e^{\sigma |n|^x}}{e^{\sigma |m|^x} e^{\sigma |n-m|^x}} & \text{if } \ 0 < x < 1, \\ \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu, \sigma \geq 1/4} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu} \frac{(1+|n|)^{\nu+1} e^{\sigma |n|}}{(1+|m|)^{\nu+1} e^{\sigma |m|} (1+|n-m|)^{\nu+1} e^{\sigma |n-m|}} & \text{if } \ x = 1. \end{cases} \tag{17.1}$$

Proposition 17.2 *Let $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < x \leq 1$. Then $1 \leq D_{\nu,x} < \infty$.*

Proof. The claim $D_{\nu,x} \geq 1$ is obviously satisfied.

Case $0 < x < 1$*:*

For every $n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, we divide the sum in the definition of $D_{\nu,x}$ into four parts, depending on n, and show that each of the partial sums is bounded independently of n. Set

$$\begin{aligned} A_n &:= \left\{ m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu : \ |m| < \frac{2}{3}|n| \right\}, \\ B_n &:= \left\{ m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus A_n : |m-n| < \frac{2}{3}|n| \right\}, \\ C_n &:= \left\{ m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus (A_n \cup B_n) : |m| < \frac{5}{3}|n| \right\}, \\ D_n &:= \mathbb{Z}^\nu \setminus (A_n \cup B_n \cup C_n). \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the sum over A_n, observe that

$$\sum_{m \in A_n} e^{-\sigma(|m|^x + |n-m|^x - |n|^x)} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor 2|n|/3 \rfloor} 2\nu(2k+1)^{\nu-1} e^{-\sigma(k^x + (|n|-k)^x - |n|^x)} \tag{17.3}$$

and

$$a^x + b^x - (a+b)^x = x \int_0^a s^{x-1} \left(1 - \left(\frac{s}{s+b}\right)^{1-x}\right) ds \geq a^x \left(1 - \left(\frac{a}{a+b}\right)^{1-x}\right)$$

for $a \geq 0$, $b > 0$. Furthermore, there exists a constant $C_1(\nu, x)$ such that

$$2\nu(2k+1)^{\nu-1} e^{-\sigma k^x \left(1 - \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{1-x}\right)} \leq \frac{C_1(\nu,x)}{(k+1)^2} \quad \text{for all } \sigma \geq \frac{1}{4},\ k \geq 0, \tag{17.4}$$

and we can bound (17.3) by $2C_1(\nu, x)$. By translation, the same estimate holds for the sum over B_n. Clearly, there exists another constant $C_2(\nu, x)$, such that

$$\sum_{m \in C_n} e^{-\sigma(|m|^x + |n-m|^x - |n|^x)} \leq (\frac{10}{3}|n| + 1)^\nu e^{-\frac{\sigma}{3}|n|^x} \leq C_2(\nu, x) \quad \text{for all } \sigma \geq \frac{1}{4},\ \ n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu. \tag{17.5}$$

Finally, for $m \in D_n$, one easily derives $|m|^x + |n-m|^x - |n|^x \geq |m|^x (1 - (3/5)^x)$, which in turn implies a uniform bound on the sum over D_n.

Case $x = 1$*:*

Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$. We use the same decomposition of $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$ into sets A_n, B_n, C_n and D_n as above. In order to estimate the sum over A_n and B_n, we use

$$\sum_{|m| < \frac{2|n|}{3}} \left(\frac{1+|n|}{(1+|m|)(1+|n-m|)}\right)^{\nu+1} < \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu} \left(\frac{3}{1+|m|}\right)^{\nu+1} < \infty. \tag{17.6}$$

For C_n we use

$$\frac{1+|n|}{(1+|m|)(1+|n-m|)} \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu, \tag{17.7}$$

and

$$\sum_{m\in C_n} e^{-\sigma(|m|+|n-m|-|n|)} \le (\frac{10}{3}|n|+1)^\nu e^{-\frac{\sigma}{3}|n|}, \tag{17.8}$$

which has an n- independent bound. Finally, to estimate the sum over D_n, we use (17.7) and

$$\sum_{m\in D_n} e^{-\sigma(|m|+|n-m|-|n|)} \le \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} e^{-\frac{2\sigma}{5}|m|}. \tag{17.9}$$

□

18 Properties of the nonlinear part

In this section we provide estimates for the nonlinear part of the equation. Let $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ and recall that $c = 0.01$ (see (4.5)). For $\sigma \ge 1/4$ we consider sequence spaces $X_{\sigma,c}$, $X_{\sigma,1}$ on $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$ and corresponding matrix spaces $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,c}$, $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,1}$. These spaces were defined in 5.21 (see also 5.15, (5.2), (5.10) and (4.6)).

Lemma 18.1 *Suppose that*

$$\sum_{k=0}^\infty \alpha_k y^k \tag{18.2}$$

defines a real power series with positive radius of convergence $0 < r \le \infty$. *There exists a positive constant* $D_W > 0$ *such that the following holds. For* $x \in \{1, c\}$ *and* $\sigma \ge 1/4$ *the map defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} W : \{u \in X_{\sigma,x} : \|u\|_{\sigma,x} < r\} &\to X_{\sigma,x}, \\ W(u) &:= \sum_{k=2}^\infty \alpha_k u^{*k} \end{aligned} \tag{18.3}$$

is analytic and statements (a) – (c) are true.

(a) For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $u, y_1, \ldots, y_j \in X_{\sigma,x}$ *with* $\|u\|_{\sigma,x} < r$,

$$(D^jW)(u)[y_1,\ldots,y_j] = \sum_{k\ge\max(2,j)} \frac{k!}{(k-j)!}\alpha_k u^{*(k-j)} * y_1 * \ldots * y_j. \tag{18.4}$$

(b) For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $2 \le j \le 22\nu^3 + 1$ *(cf. (4.19)),* y_1, …, y_{j-1}, $u \in X_{\sigma,x}$ *with* $\|u\|_{\sigma,x} \le \min(1,r)/2$

$$\begin{aligned} \|W(u)\|_{\sigma,x} &\le D_W\|u\|^2_{\sigma,x} \\ \|(DW)(u)\|_{\sigma,x} &\le D_W\|u\|_{\sigma,x} \\ \|D^jW(u)[y_1,\ldots,y_{j-1},\cdot]\|_{\sigma,x} &\le D_W\|y_1\|_{\sigma,x}\cdot\ \ldots\ \cdot\|y_{j-1}\|_{\sigma,x} \end{aligned} \tag{18.5}$$

(c) For $L > 0$, $u \in X_{1,c}$ with $\|u\|_{1,c} \leq \min(1,r)/2$ and supp$(u) \subset B_L(0)$ (i.e. $u(m) = 0$ for $|m| \geq L$)

$$\left\|W(u)\chi_{\{|m|\geq 3L\}}\right\|_{1/4,c} \leq D_W e^{-\frac{9}{4}L^c}\|u\|_{1,c}^2. \tag{18.6}$$

Proof. The analyticity of W and statement (a) are obvious. In view of proposition 5.5 the estimates of (b) follow from standard arguments for power series. In order to prove (c) we first observe that for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and for numbers $L \geq a_1 \geq \ldots \geq a_k \geq 0$ with $a_1 + \ldots + a_k \geq 3L$ the following holds

$$\begin{aligned}
a_1^c + \ldots + a_k^c - 3L^c &= c\left(\int_0^{a_1} t^{c-1}dt + \ldots + \int_0^{a_k} t^{c-1}dt - 3\int_0^L t^{c-1}dt\right) \\
&= c\left[\left(\sum_{j=4}^{k}\int_0^{a_j} t^{c-1}dt\right) - \left(\int_{a_1}^L t^{c-1}dt + \int_{a_2}^L t^{c-1}dt + \int_{a_3}^L t^{c-1}dt\right)\right] \\
&= c[I - II] \geq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{18.7}$$

Indeed, the last inequality, or equivalently $I \geq II$, is easy to see: firstly, the total length of the domain of integration in I equals to $a_4 + \ldots + a_k \geq 3L - a_1 - a_2 - a_3$ and is hence bigger or equal to the total length of the integration domain in II. Secondly, by the ordering of the a_j's and the monotonicity of t^{c-1} it is clear that the integrands in I are pointwise bigger than a_4^{c-1} whereas the integrands in II are pointwise bounded above by $a_3^{c-1} \leq a_4^{c-1}$. Hence (18.7) is established. Using in addition lemma 5.16 (cf. (5.1)) we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|W(u)\chi_{\{|m|\geq 3L\}}\right\|_{1/4,c} \\
\leq\ & \sum_{k\geq 2}|\alpha_k| \sum_{\substack{s_1+\ldots+s_k=m \\ |m|\geq 3L}} |u(s_1)|\cdot\ldots\cdot|u(s_k)|w_{1/4,c}(m) \qquad (18.8) \\
\leq\ & \sum_{k\geq 2}|\alpha_k| \sum_{\substack{s_1+\ldots+s_k=m \\ |m|\geq 3L}} |u(s_1)|w_{1/4,c}(s_1)\cdot\ldots\cdot|u(s_k)|w_{1/4,c}(s_k) \\
\leq\ & \sum_{k\geq 2}|\alpha_k| \sum_{\substack{s_1+\ldots+s_k=m \\ |m|\geq 3L}} |u(s_1)|w_{1,c}(s_1)\cdot\ldots\cdot|u(s_k)|w_{1,c}(s_k)e^{-\frac{3}{4}(|s_1|^c+\ldots+|s_k|^c)} \\
\leq\ & e^{-\frac{3}{4}3L^c}\sum_{k\geq 2}|\alpha_k| \sum_{\substack{s_1+\ldots+s_k=m \\ m\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu}} |u(s_1)|w_{1,c}(s_1)\cdot\ldots\cdot|u(s_k)|w_{1,c}(s_k)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \quad e^{-\frac{3}{4}3L^c} \sum_{k\geq 2} |\alpha_k| \|u\|_{1,c}^k.$$

This establishes claim (c). ☐

19 Properties of the linearized operators

In this section we prove various properties of the matrices $T^{(j)}(\lambda)$, $T^{(j)}(\theta, \lambda)$ which are used in the analysis of chapter II. We provide estimates on the diagonal entries (proposition 19.1) as well as certain symmetry properties (propositions 19.15 and 19.18).

Proposition 19.1 *Recall the definitions of ν (2.11), $\omega_j^{(0)}$ (2.12), and of the function V_j, $j \in \mathbb{N}$ (4.12). There exist constants $0 < d_V, \delta_V \leq 1 \leq D_V$ such that the following holds.*

(a) For all $1 \leq j \leq \nu$, $0 < \delta < \delta_V$ and $\vartheta \in \mathbb{C}$

$$\begin{aligned} dist(\vartheta, \{\pm w_j^{(0)}\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) &> \delta \Rightarrow |V_j(\vartheta)| > d_V \delta, \\ dist(\vartheta, \{\pm w_j^{(0)}\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) &\leq \delta \Rightarrow |V_j(\vartheta)| \leq D_V \delta, \\ |(d/d\vartheta)^k V_j(\vartheta)| &\leq D_V \quad \text{for } 0 \leq k \leq 1 + 8\nu^2,\ |\vartheta \mp \omega_j^{(0)}| < \delta_V. \end{aligned}$$

(b) For $1 \leq j \leq \nu$ there exist smooth functions $\tilde{V}_{j,+} : B_{\delta_V}(\omega_j^{(0)}) \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\tilde{V}_{j,-} : B_{\delta_V}(-\omega_j^{(0)}) \to \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$V_j(\vartheta) = \tilde{V}_{j,+}(\vartheta)(\vartheta - \omega_j^{(0)}) \quad \text{for } \vartheta \in B_{\delta_V}(\omega_j^{(0)}), \tag{19.2}$$

$$V_j(\vartheta) = \tilde{V}_{j,-}(\vartheta)(\vartheta + \omega_j^{(0)}) \quad \text{for } \vartheta \in B_{\delta_V}(-\omega_j^{(0)}). \tag{19.3}$$

Furthermore

$$|\tilde{V}_{j,\pm}(\vartheta)| \geq d_V \quad \text{for } \vartheta \in B_{\delta_V}(\pm\omega_j^{(0)}), \tag{19.4}$$

$$|(d/d\vartheta)^k (1/\tilde{V}_{j,\pm})(\vartheta)| \leq D_V \quad \text{for } 0 \leq k \leq 22\nu^3,\ \vartheta \in B_{\delta_V}(\pm\omega_j^{(0)}). \tag{19.5}$$

Proof. Recall that $\omega_j^{(0)} \in (0, \pi)$ by assumption A2 (cf. (2.12)). Therefore $V_j'(\pm\omega_j^{(0)}) \neq 0$ and there exist $\delta_V > 0$, $d_{V,1} > 0$ such that $\omega_1^{(0)} - \delta_V > 0$ and

$$|V_j(\vartheta)| \geq d_{V,1} |\vartheta - \omega_j^{(0)}| \quad \text{for all } \vartheta \in U_{\delta_V}(\omega_j^{(0)}), \tag{19.6}$$

$$|V_j(\vartheta)| \geq d_{V,1} |\vartheta + \omega_j^{(0)}| \quad \text{for all } \vartheta \in U_{\delta_V}(-\omega_j^{(0)}). \tag{19.7}$$

Observe further that the zeros of V_j form a set $\{\pm w_j^{(0)}\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. Since V_j is a 2π – periodic function and $\lim_{|Imz|\to\infty} V_j(z) = \alpha_1 > 0$ we conclude

$$m := \inf\{|V_j(\vartheta)| \ : \ \vartheta \in \mathbb{C},\ \mathrm{dist}(\vartheta, \{\pm w_j^{(0)}\} + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) \geq \delta_V\} > 0 \tag{19.8}$$

Setting

$$d_V := \frac{1}{2}\min(d_{V,1}, m/\delta_V, 2) \tag{19.9}$$

we have satisfied the first estimate in (a). The second and third estimates in (a) are true if

$$D_V \geq \max_{1\leq j\leq \nu, 0\leq k\leq 8\nu^2+1} \sup_{\vartheta\in U_{\delta_V}(\pm\omega_j^{(0)})} |(d/d\vartheta)^k V_j(\vartheta)|. \tag{19.10}$$

The right hand side of (19.10) is finite since the distance of $U_{\delta_V}(\pm\omega_j^{(0)})$ to the set $2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ is positive by the choice of δ_V ($\omega_1^{(0)} - \delta_V > 0$).

To prove (b) observe first that (19.2) is satisfied with

$$\tilde{V}_{j,+}(\vartheta) = \int_0^1 V_j'(\omega_j^{(0)} + s(\vartheta - \omega_j^{(0)}))ds. \tag{19.11}$$

The estimate (19.4) follows from (19.2), (19.6) and (19.9). The existence of the constant D_V follows from the estimate (19.4), since δ_V is chosen such that $\omega_1^{(0)} - \delta_V > 0$ (and consequently $\mathrm{dist}(B_{\delta_V}(\omega_j^{(0)}), 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) > 0$). The proof of the corresponding statements for $V_{j,-}$ is similar and will not be repeated here.

$\square$

Recall the definition of the nonlinear map W in section 18 and of the functions $V(\omega)$, $V(\theta,\omega)$ in (2.16), (3.31). For $u \in X_{\sigma,x}$, $\sigma \geq 1/4$, $x \in \{0.01, 1\}$ and $\|u\|_{\sigma,x} < r_{F,b}$ (cf. (4.8)) we may define

$$\begin{aligned} T(\omega)(m,n) &= V(\omega)(m)\delta_{m,n} + DW(u)(m,n), && (19.12)\\ T(\theta,\omega)(m,n) &= V(\theta,\omega)(m)\delta_{m,n} + DW(u)(m,n). && (19.13)\end{aligned}$$

By lemma 18.1 (a) we can express

$$DW(u)(m,n) = \left(\sum_{k\geq 2} k\alpha_k u^{*(k-1)}\right)(m-n). \tag{19.14}$$

Using (19.14) and the definition of the convolution (see (5.4)), the following two propositions are easy to verify.

Proposition 19.15 *Let $T(\omega)$ be defined as in (19.12).*

(a) Suppose that $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$ and u satisfies $u(m) = u(-m) \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$. Then

$$T(\omega)(m,n) = T(\omega)(-m,-n) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\} \quad \textit{for all } \ m,n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu. \tag{19.16}$$

(b) Let $1 \leq j \leq \nu$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{C}^\nu$. Suppose that $u(m) = 0$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ with $m_j \neq 0$. Then

$$T(\omega)(m,n) = 0 \quad \textit{if } m_j \neq n_j. \tag{19.17}$$

Proposition 19.18 *Let $\theta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\omega \in \mathbb{C}^\nu$ and let $T(\theta,\omega)$ be defined as in (19.13). For $k \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ with $< k, g >= 0$ the following translation property holds.*

$$T(\theta,\omega)(m+k,n+k) = T(\theta + < \omega, k >, \omega)(m,n). \tag{19.19}$$

20 The coupling lemma

In this section we state and prove a version of the coupling lemma which first appeared in [44]. The main advantage of this coupling lemma over other versions is that one may couple local inverse matrices of all length scales in one step. The proof of the coupling lemma 20.1 proceeds by constructing a parametrix for the inverse matrix. The columns of the parametrix are given by the corresponding columns of the local inverse matrices.

Recall the definitions of ν (2.11), $c = 0.01$ (4.5), of the weight functions $w_{\sigma,c}$ on $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$ (definition 5.15), and of the corresponding matrix spaces $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,c}$ (definition 5.21).

Lemma 20.1 *Let $\sigma \geq \tilde{\sigma} \geq 1/4$ and let Λ be a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$. Suppose that*

$$T(m,n) = D(m,n) + R(m,n), \quad m,n \in \Lambda, \tag{20.2}$$

where D is a diagonal matrix. Suppose further, that for each $n \in \Lambda$ there exist numbers $l_n > 0$, $0 \leq \mu_n \leq \sigma - \tilde{\sigma}$, $C_n > 0$ and a set $U(n) \subset \Lambda$, $n \in U(n)$, satisfying

$$T_{U(n)}^{-1} \textit{ exists and } \|T_{U(n)}^{-1}\|_{\tilde{\sigma}+\mu_n,c} \leq C_n, \tag{20.3}$$

$$\textit{dist } (n, \Lambda \setminus U(n)) \geq l_n, \tag{20.4}$$

$$C_n e^{-\mu_n l_n^c} \|R\|_{\sigma,c} \leq \frac{1}{2}. \tag{20.5}$$

Then the matrix T_Λ is invertible with

$$\|T_\Lambda^{-1}\|_{\tilde{\sigma},c} \leq (1 + w_{\tilde{\sigma},c}(0))C, \qquad \textit{where } \ C := \sup_{n\in\Lambda} C_n. \tag{20.6}$$

Proof. The proof of lemma 20.1 proceeds in three steps. First we define matrices P and K satisfying

$$(T_\Lambda)\, P = I + K, \tag{20.7}$$

where I denotes the identity matrix restricted to the sub-lattice Λ. In step 2 we show that

$$\|K\|_{\tilde{\sigma},c} \le \frac{1}{2}. \tag{20.8}$$

Since the norm is sub-multiplicative (see proposition 5.14 and lemma 5.16) the inverse of $I+K$ can be expanded in a Neumann series with $\|(I+K)^{-1}\|_{\tilde{\sigma},c} \le \|I\|_{\tilde{\sigma},c} + 1 = 1 + w_{\tilde{\sigma},c}(0)$. Hence we have constructed a right inverse of T_Λ and, as Λ is finite, the inverse matrix T_Λ^{-1} exists. Claim (20.6) then follows from

$$\|P\|_{\tilde{\sigma},c} \le C, \tag{20.9}$$

which is derived in step 3.

Step 1: Proof of (20.7). Define

$$\begin{aligned} P(m,n) \quad &:= \quad \begin{cases} T_{U(n)}^{-1}(m,n) & \text{for } n \in \Lambda, m \in U(n), \\ 0 & \text{else }, \end{cases} && (20.10) \\ K(m,n) \quad &:= \quad \begin{cases} \sum_{p \in U(n)} R(m,p) P(p,n) & \text{for } n \in \Lambda, m \in \Lambda \setminus U(n), \\ 0 & \text{else }. \end{cases} && (20.11) \end{aligned}$$

Relation (20.7) then follows from

$$\sum_{p \in \Lambda} (T_\Lambda)\,(m,p) P(p,n) = \begin{cases} \sum_{p \in U(n)} T(m,p) T_{U(n)}^{-1}(p,n) = \delta_{m,n} & \text{for } n \in \Lambda, \;\; m \in U(n), \\ \sum_{p \in U(n)} R(m,p) P(p,n) = K(m,n) & \text{for } n \in \Lambda, \;\; m \in \Lambda \setminus U(n). \end{cases}$$

Step 2: Proof of (20.8). Fix $n \in \Lambda$. Using lemma 5.16, (20.4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{m \in \Lambda} w_{\tilde{\sigma},c}(m-n)|K(m,n)| \le \sum_{m \in \Lambda \setminus U(n)} w_{\tilde{\sigma}+\mu_n,c}(m-n)|K(m,n)| e^{-\mu_n l_n^c} \\ \le \quad & \sum_{m \in \Lambda \setminus U(n)} \sum_{p \in U(n)} w_{\tilde{\sigma}+\mu_n,c}(m-p)|R(m,p)| w_{\tilde{\sigma}+\mu_n,c}(p-n) |T_{U(n)}^{-1}(p,n)| e^{-\mu_n l_n^c} \\ \le \quad & \sum_{p \in U(n)} \|R\|_{\tilde{\sigma}+\mu_n,c} \, w_{\tilde{\sigma}+\mu_n,c}(p-n) \, |T_{U(n)}^{-1}(p,n)| \, e^{-\mu_n l_n^c} \\ \le \quad & \|R\|_{\tilde{\sigma}+\mu_n,c} \, \|T_{U(n)}^{-1}\|_{\tilde{\sigma}+\mu_n,c} \, e^{-\mu_n l_n^c} \le \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Step 3: Proof of (20.9). Fix $n \in \Lambda$. Clearly,

$$\sum_{m\in\Lambda} w_{\tilde{\sigma},c}(m-n)|P(m,n)| \leq \sum_{m\in U(n)} w_{\tilde{\sigma}+\mu_n,c}(m-n)|T_{U(n)}^{-1}(m,n)| \leq \|T_{U(n)}^{-1}\|_{\tilde{\sigma}+\mu_n,c} \leq C_n \leq C.$$

□

21 A version of the Weierstrass Preparation Theorem

In our analysis of chapter II we need a version of the Weierstrass preparation theorem which provides estimates on the derivatives of the coefficients of the resulting polynomials. Such a version was stated and proved by Bourgain in [6]. For the sake of completeness we reproduce Bourgain's proof in this section.

We begin with a simple application of the Banach fixed point theorem.

Proposition 21.1 *Let $(X, |\cdot|)$ be a Banach space, $x_0 \in X$, $\eta > 0$ and denote $K_\eta(x_0) := \{x \in X : |x - x_0| \leq \eta\}$. Assume furthermore, that $F : K_\eta(x_0) \to X$ is a C^1 map with*

$$\|DF(x) - I\| \leq 1/5, \quad \text{for all } x \in K_\eta(x_0), \tag{21.2}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the operator norm and I is the identity map.

If $|F(x_0)| \leq 2\eta/5$ then there exists a unique $y \in K_\eta(x_0)$ with $F(y) = 0$. Furthermore, $|y - x_0| \leq \frac{5}{2}|F(x_0)|$.

Proof. It follows from (21.2) that $DF(x_0)$ is invertible with $\|DF(x_0)^{-1}\| \leq 5/4$. We define

$$T : K_\eta(x_0) \to X \ ; \quad T(x) = x - DF(x_0)^{-1}F(x)$$

Note that the zeros of F are precisely the fixed points of T. For x_1, $x_2 \in K_\eta(x_0)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T(x_1) - T(x_2) &= x_1 - x_2 + DF(x_0)^{-1}\left(\int_0^1 DF(x_1 + t(x_2 - x_1))dt\right)(x_2 - x_1) \\ &= DF(x_0)^{-1}\left(\int_0^1 [DF(x_1 + t(x_2 - x_1)) - DF(x_0)]dt\right)(x_2 - x_1). \end{aligned}$$

From (21.2) we conclude that $\|DF(x_1 + t(x_2 - x_1)) - DF(x_0)\| \leq 2/5$ and therefore

$$|T(x_1) - T(x_2)| \leq \frac{5}{4} \cdot \frac{2}{5}|x_2 - x_1| = \frac{1}{2}|x_1 - x_2|. \tag{21.3}$$

Furthermore, for all $x \in K_\eta(x_0)$ we have

$$|T(x) - x_0| \leq |T(x) - T(x_0)| + |T(x_0) - x_0| \leq \frac{1}{2}|x - x_0| + \frac{5}{4}|F(x_0)| < \frac{\eta}{2} + \frac{5}{4} \cdot \frac{2\eta}{5} = \eta.$$

This shows that T is a contraction on $K_\eta(x_0)$ and has thus an unique fixed point y. Finally,

$$|y - x_0| = |T(y) - x_0| \leq |T(y) - T(x_0)| + |T(x_0) - x_0| \leq \frac{1}{2}|y - x_0| + \frac{5}{4}|F(x_0)|,$$

from which $|y - x_0| \leq \frac{5}{2}|F(x_0)|$ follows. □

Lemma 21.4 *Let d, ν, B_1, $B_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2\nu}$, and let δ, ρ, ϵ, C, C^* be positive constants satisfying*

$$\delta \leq 1 \tag{21.5}$$

$$C^* \geq 1 \tag{21.6}$$

$$200d\epsilon < 1 \tag{21.7}$$

$$30C^*(B_1!)2^{B_1} \leq C \tag{21.8}$$

$$d(B_1 + 1) \leq B_2 \tag{21.9}$$

$$16\nu C d\rho < \left(\frac{\delta}{6d}\right)^d \tag{21.10}$$

$$(6d)^{d(B_1+1)} \leq B_2! \tag{21.11}$$

Assume further that

$$f : \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z|, \delta\} \times \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{2\nu} : |\lambda - \lambda_0| < \rho\} \to \mathbb{C}$$

is an analytic function of the form

$$f(z, \lambda) = z^d + \sum_{0 \leq j < d} a_j(\lambda) z^j + r(z, \lambda), \tag{21.12}$$

where for $z \in U_\delta(0)$, $\lambda \in U_\rho(\lambda_0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |a_j(\lambda)| &\leq \frac{1}{8d} \quad \textit{for all } 0 \leq j < d, && (21.13) \\ \left|\partial^\beta a_j(\lambda)\right| &\leq C \quad \textit{for all } 1 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq B_1,\ 0 \leq j < d, && (21.14) \end{aligned}$$

$$\left|\partial^\beta r(z, \lambda)\right| \leq \begin{cases} \epsilon & \textit{for} \quad |\beta_\lambda|_1 = 0, \qquad 0 \leq |\beta_z| \leq B_2, \\ C^* & \textit{for} \quad 1 \leq |\beta_\lambda|_1 \leq B_1, \quad 0 \leq |\beta_z| \leq B_2. \end{cases} \tag{21.15}$$

Suppose that a_j, r are real functions, i.e. $a_j(\lambda)$, $r(z, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}$ for $z \in U_\delta(0) \cap \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda \in U_\rho(\lambda_0) \cap \mathbb{R}^{2\nu}$.

Then there exist functions

$$\begin{aligned} Q &: U_{\delta/4}(0) \times U_\rho(\lambda_0) \to \mathbb{C}, \\ b_j &: U_\rho(\lambda_0) \to \mathbb{C},\ \ 0 \leq j < d, \end{aligned}$$

such that for all $z \in U_{\delta/4}(0)$*,* $\lambda \in U_\rho(\lambda_0)$ *and* $0 \le j < d$ *the following holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} f(z,\lambda) &= [1+Q(z,\lambda)]\left(z^d + \sum_{0\le j<d} b_j(\lambda) z^j\right), && (21.16)\\ |Q(z,\lambda)| &\le \frac{1}{10}, && (21.17)\\ |b_j(\lambda)| &\le \frac{1}{2d}, && (21.18)\\ \left|\partial^\beta b_j(\lambda)\right| &\le \left(\frac{5}{2}C\right)^{2|\beta|_1-1}(d+B_1)^{|\beta|_1^2} \quad \textit{for } 1 \le |\beta|_1 \le B_1, && (21.19)\\ b_j(\lambda) &\in \mathbb{R} \quad \textit{for } \lambda \in U_\rho(\lambda_0)\cap\mathbb{R}^{2\nu}. && (21.20) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume for the proof that $\lambda_0 = 0$. Recall the basic idea to prove the Weierstrass preparation theorem. Denote for $b \in \mathbb{C}^d$ the polynomial

$$p_b(z) = z^d + \sum_{0\le j<d} b_j z^j. \tag{21.21}$$

Computing $(p_b(s) - p_b(z))/(s-z)$ one easily derives the following formula

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{s-z} &= \frac{1}{p_b(s)(s-z)}p_b(z) + \sum_{k=0}^{d-1}\frac{q_k(b,s)}{p_b(s)}z^k, \quad \text{where} && (21.22)\\ q_k(b,s) &:= s^{d-1-k} + \sum_{l=k+1}^{d-1} b_l s^{l-1-k}. && (21.23) \end{aligned}$$

Let $0 < \alpha < \delta$. By the Cauchy integral formula

$$r(z,\lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{|s|=\alpha}\frac{r(s,\lambda)}{s-z}ds \tag{21.24}$$

for $|z| < \alpha$. Using representation (21.22) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f(z,\lambda) = & \left(1 + \oint_{|s|=\alpha}\frac{r(s,\lambda)}{p_b(s)(s-z)}\frac{ds}{2\pi i}\right)p_b(z) && (21.25)\\ & + \sum_{k=0}^{d-1}\left(a_k(\lambda) - b_k + \oint_{|s|=\alpha}\frac{r(s,\lambda)q_k(b,s)}{p_b(s)}\frac{ds}{2\pi i}\right)z^k. \end{aligned}$$

To prove the Weierstrass preparation theorem one needs to show that $b = b(\lambda)$ can be chosen such that the second line in (21.25) vanishes.

For our purposes it is convenient to split the remainder term r into two parts and apply the above described procedure twice with different choices of α. According to Taylor's formula we decompose

$$\begin{aligned} r(z,\lambda) &= \sum_{j=0}^{B_2-1} c_j(\lambda)z^j + \tilde{r}(z,\lambda), \quad \text{with} && (21.26)\\ c_j(\lambda) &:= \frac{1}{j!}\partial_z^j r(0,\lambda), && (21.27)\\ \tilde{r}(z,\lambda) &:= \frac{1}{(B_2-1)!}\int_0^z \left(\partial_z^{B_2} r\right)(s,\lambda)(z-s)^{B_2-1}ds && (21.28)\end{aligned}$$

and denote

$$f(z,\lambda) = z^d + \sum_{0\le j<d} a_j(\lambda)z^j + \sum_{j=0}^{B_2-1} c_j(\lambda)z^j + \tilde{r}(z,\lambda) \equiv \tilde{f}(z,\lambda) + \tilde{r}(z,\lambda). \tag{21.29}$$

From hypothesis (21.15) the following estimates are immediate.

$$\begin{aligned} |c_j(\lambda)| &\le \frac{1}{j!}\epsilon && \text{for } \lambda \in U_\rho(0), && (21.30)\\ |\partial^\beta c_j(\lambda)| &\le \frac{1}{j!}C^* && \text{for } \lambda \in U_\rho(0),\ \ 1 \le |\beta|_1 \le B_1, && (21.31)\\ |\tilde{r}(z,\lambda)| &\le \frac{1}{B_2!}\epsilon |z|^{B_2} && \text{for } z \in U_\delta(0),\ \ \lambda \in U_\rho(0), && (21.32)\\ |\partial_\lambda^\beta \tilde{r}(z,\lambda)| &\le \frac{1}{B_2!}C^* |z|^{B_2} && \text{for } z \in U_\delta(0),\ \ \lambda \in U_\rho(0),\ \ 1 \le |\beta|_1 \le B_1. && (21.33)\end{aligned}$$

In a first step we apply the above described procedure to the auxiliary function $\tilde{f}$ (see (21.29)). For $b \in \mathbb{C}^d$, $|b| < 1/(2d)$ and $s \in \mathbb{C}$, $|s| = 1$ we have $|p_b(s)| \ge 1/2$. We can therefore apply (21.22) and obtain for $(b,z,\lambda) \in U_{1/(2d)}(0) \times U_\delta(0) \times U_\rho(0) \subset \mathbb{C}^d \times \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^{2\nu}$

$$\tilde{f}(z,\lambda) = (1 + \tilde{Q}(b,z,\lambda))p_b(z) + \sum_{k=0}^{d-1}(a_k(\lambda) - b_k + \tilde{R}_k(b,\lambda))z^k, \tag{21.34}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}(b,z,\lambda) &:= \sum_{j=0}^{B_2-1} c_j(\lambda) \oint_{|s|=1} \frac{s^j}{p_b(s)(s-z)}\frac{ds}{2\pi i}, && (21.35)\\ \tilde{R}_k(b,\lambda) &:= \sum_{j=0}^{B_2-1} c_j(\lambda) \oint_{|s|=1} \frac{q_k(b,s)s^j}{p_b(s)}\frac{ds}{2\pi i}, \quad \text{for } 0 \le k < d. && (21.36)\end{aligned}$$

We will now determine $b = \tilde{b}(\lambda)$ in such a way that $a_k(\lambda) - b_k - \tilde{R}(b,\lambda) = 0$ for all $0 \le k < d$. To achieve this we define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G} &: \quad U_{1/(2d)}(0) \times U_\rho(0) \to \mathbb{C}^d; \quad \tilde{G} = (\tilde{G}_0, \ldots \tilde{G}_{d-1}) \quad \text{with} \\ \tilde{G}_k(b,\lambda) &:= \quad b_k - a_k(\lambda) - \tilde{R}_k(b,\lambda). \quad \text{for } 0 \le k < d. && (21.37)\end{aligned}$$

Claim 1: *For every* $\lambda \in U_\rho(0)$ *there exists an unique* $\tilde{b}(\lambda) \in U_{\frac{3}{8d}}(0)$ *such that* $\tilde{G}(\tilde{b}(\lambda),\lambda) = 0$*. Moreover, the function* $\lambda \mapsto \tilde{b}(\lambda)$ *is analytic and the first order derivatives are bounded by* $|\partial^\beta \tilde{b}(\lambda)| \leq 2C$ *for all* $\lambda \in U_\rho(0)$*,* $|\beta|_1 = 1$*.*

Proof of claim 1: The definitions of p_b and q_k (see (21.21), (21.23)) yield the following estimates for $|b| < 1/(2d)$ and $|s| = 1$.

$$\left|\frac{q_k(b,s)s^j}{p_b(s)}\right| \leq 4, \quad 0 \leq k < d, \;\; j \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tag{21.38}$$

$$\left|\partial_{b_l}\frac{q_k(b,s)s^j}{p_b(s)}\right| \leq 10, \quad 0 \leq k,l < d, \;\; j \in \mathbb{N}_0. \tag{21.39}$$

These estimates together with (21.30), (21.7), (21.14), (21.31) imply for $|b| < 1/(2d)$, $|\lambda| < \rho$, $0 \leq k,l < d$ (denoting $a := (a_j)_{0 \leq j < d}$)

$$|\tilde{G}_k(a(\lambda),\lambda)| = |\tilde{R}_k(a(\lambda),\lambda)| \leq \sum_{j\geq 0}\frac{\epsilon}{j!}4 \leq 12\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{15d}, \tag{21.40}$$

$$\left|\partial_{b_l}\tilde{G}_k(b,\lambda) - \delta_{k,l}\right| \leq \sum_{j\geq 0}\frac{\epsilon}{j!}10 \leq 30\epsilon < \frac{1}{6d}, \tag{21.41}$$

$$\left|\partial_\lambda^\beta \tilde{G}_k(b,\lambda)\right| \leq C + \sum_{j\geq 0}\frac{C^*}{j!}4 \leq C + 12C^*, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq B_1. \tag{21.42}$$

We apply proposition 21.1 to obtain $\tilde{b}(\lambda)$. Choose $(X, |\cdot|)$ to be $\mathbb{C}^d$ together with the maximum norm. We fix $\lambda \in B_\rho(0)$ and set $x_0 \equiv a(\lambda)$, $\eta \equiv \frac{1}{4d}$ and

$$F(x) := \tilde{G}(x,\lambda) \quad \text{for } x \in K_{1/(4d)}(a(\lambda)) \subset U_{1/(2d)}(0) \quad (cf.(21.13)).$$

Note that it follows from (21.41) that $\|DF(x) - I\| = \|D_x\tilde{G}(x,\lambda) - I\| \leq 30\epsilon d < \frac{1}{6}$. Inequality (21.40) implies that $|F(x_0)| \leq \frac{1}{15d} < \frac{2}{5}\eta$. Hence there exists an unique $\tilde{b}(\lambda)$ satisfying $F(\tilde{b}(\lambda)) = 0$. Furthermore $|\tilde{b}(\lambda) - a(\lambda)| \leq 2.5\frac{1}{15d} < \frac{1}{4d}$. Since $|a(\lambda)| \leq 1/(8d)$ by (21.13) we conclude that $\tilde{b}(\lambda) \in U_{\frac{3}{8d}}(0)$.

The analyticity of $\tilde{b}$ as a function of λ follows from the analyticity of $\tilde{G}$ by a standard implicit function theorem. Moreover, differentiating $G(\tilde{b}(\lambda),\lambda) = 0$ with respect to λ_l, $1 \leq l \leq 2\nu$, and using $\|D_b\tilde{G} - I\| \leq 1/5$, (21.42), and (21.8) we obtain

$$\left|\partial_{\lambda_l}\tilde{b}\right| \leq \left|(D_b\tilde{G})^{-1}\partial_{\lambda_l}\tilde{G}\right| \leq \frac{5}{4}(C + 12C^*) < 2C.$$

This completes the proof of claim 1.

We have constructed a representation for $\tilde{f}$ in the desired form

$$\tilde{f}(z,\lambda) = (1 + Q(\tilde{b}(\lambda),z,\lambda))p_{\tilde{b}(\lambda)}(z).$$

Since $f = \tilde{f} + \tilde{r}$ we now apply (21.24), (21.22) with r being replaced by the smaller remainder term $\tilde{r}$. First we choose the radius for the contour of integration.

Claim 2: *There exists* $\frac{\delta}{2} < \alpha < \delta$ *such that*

$$|p_b(s)| \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\delta}{6d}\right)^d \quad \textit{for } |s| = \alpha, \quad \textit{and} \quad b \in \mathcal{B} := U_{\frac{1}{2d}\left(\frac{\delta}{6d}\right)^d}(\tilde{b}(0)). \tag{21.43}$$

For all $\lambda \in U_\rho(0)$ *the following estimate holds*

$$|\tilde{b}(\lambda) - \tilde{b}(0)| < \frac{1}{4d}\left(\frac{\delta}{6d}\right)^d. \tag{21.44}$$

Proof of claim 2: Estimate (21.44) follows from claim 1 and (21.10). Denote the zeros of $p_{\tilde{b}(0)}$ by $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_d$. Choose $\alpha \in (\delta/2, \delta)$ such that $|\alpha - |\xi_l|| > \frac{\delta}{6d}$ for $1 \leq l \leq d$. For $s \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|s| = \alpha$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$ it follows from (21.5) that

$$|p_b(s)| \geq \left|p_{\tilde{b}(0)}(s)\right| - \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\delta}{6d}\right)^d \geq \prod_{l=1}^{d} ||s| - |\xi_l|| - \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\delta}{6d}\right)^d \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\delta}{6d}\right)^d.$$

This proves claim 2.

Note that $b \in \mathcal{B}$, (21.5) and claim 1 imply

$$|b| \leq |\tilde{b}(0)| + \frac{1}{12d} < \frac{3}{8d} + \frac{1}{12d} < \frac{1}{2d}.$$

We conclude $\mathcal{B} \subset U_{1/(2d)}(0)$. For $z \in U_\alpha(0)$, $\lambda \in U_\rho(0)$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$ we obtain the following representation of the function f

$$f(z, \lambda) = (1 + Q(b, z, \lambda))p_b(z) + \sum_{k=0}^{d-1}(a_k(\lambda) - b_k + R_k(b, \lambda))z^k, \tag{21.45}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Q(b, z, \lambda) &:= \tilde{Q}(b, z, \lambda) + \oint_{|s|=\alpha} \frac{\tilde{r}(s, \lambda)}{p_b(s)(s - z)}\frac{ds}{2\pi i}, && (21.46)\\ R_k(b, \lambda) &:= \tilde{R}_k(b, \lambda) + \oint_{|s|=\alpha} \frac{q_k(b, s)\tilde{r}(s, \lambda)}{p_b(s)}\frac{ds}{2\pi i}, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq k < d. && (21.47) \end{aligned}$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned} G &: \mathcal{B} \times U_\rho(0) \to \mathbb{C}^d; \quad G = (G_0, \ldots, G_{d-1}) \quad \text{with} \\ G_k(b, \lambda) &:= b_k - a_k(\lambda) - R_k(b, \lambda) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq k < d. && (21.48) \end{aligned}$$

Claim 3: *There exists an analytic function $b : U_\rho(0) \to \mathcal{B}$ satisfying $G(b(\lambda), \lambda) = 0$.*

Proof of claim 3: Using $\tilde{G}(\tilde{b}(\lambda), \lambda) = 0$ we can express G_k by

$$G_k(b, \lambda) = (b_k - \tilde{b}_k(\lambda)) + [\tilde{R}_k(\tilde{b}(\lambda), \lambda) - \tilde{R}_k(b, \lambda)] + [\tilde{R}_k(b, \lambda) - R_k(b, \lambda)].$$

Fix $\lambda \in U_\rho(0)$. We introduce the new variable

$$x := b - \tilde{b}(\lambda). \tag{21.49}$$

By (21.43) and (21.44) it suffices to show that there exists $x \in \overline{U_{\frac{1}{4d}\left(\frac{\delta}{6d}\right)^d}(0)} \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ solving $F(x) = 0$, where $F = (F_0, \ldots, F_{d-1})$ is defined by

$$F_k(x) := x_k - [\tilde{R}_k(x + \tilde{b}(\lambda), \lambda) - \tilde{R}_k(\tilde{b}(\lambda), \lambda)] - [R_k(x + \tilde{b}(\lambda), \lambda) - \tilde{R}_k(x + \tilde{b}(\lambda), \lambda)] \tag{21.50}$$

for $0 \leq k < d$. To obtain the existence of the zero of F we again apply proposition 21.1. In the notation of proposition 21.1 $(X, |\cdot|)$ is given by $\mathbb{C}^d$ together with the maximum norm, $x_0 \equiv 0$ and $\eta \equiv \frac{1}{4d}\left(\frac{\delta}{6d}\right)^d$. We need to derive the estimates on $|F(0)|$ and $\|DF(x) - I\|$. For $0 \leq k, l < d$ the above definitions yield

$$\begin{aligned}
F_k(0) &= -\oint_{|s|=\alpha} \frac{\tilde{r}(s, \lambda) q_k(\tilde{b}(\lambda), s)}{p_{\tilde{b}(\lambda)}(s)} \frac{ds}{2\pi i}, \\
\partial_{x_l} F_k(x) - \delta_{l,k} &= -\sum_{j=0}^{B_2 - 1} c_j(\lambda) \oint_{|s|=1} s^j \partial_{x_l} \left(\frac{q_k(x + \tilde{b}(\lambda), s)}{p_{x + \tilde{b}(\lambda)}(s)} \right) \frac{ds}{2\pi i} \\
&\quad - \oint_{|s|=\alpha} \tilde{r}(s, \lambda) \partial_{x_l} \left(\frac{q_k(x + \tilde{b}(\lambda), s)}{P_{x + \tilde{b}(\lambda)}(s)} \right) \frac{ds}{2\pi i}.
\end{aligned}$$

For $|s| = \alpha$ and $|x| \leq \frac{1}{4d}\left(\frac{\delta}{6d}\right)^d$ we have $|x + \tilde{b}(\lambda) - \tilde{b}(0)| < \frac{1}{2d}\left(\frac{\delta}{6d}\right)^d$, i.e. $x + \tilde{b}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{B} \subset U_{1/(2d)}(0)$. Then claim 2 implies for $0 \leq l < d$ (use also $\alpha < \delta \leq 1$ by (21.5))

$$\left| \partial_{x_l} \left(\frac{q_k(x + \tilde{b}(\lambda), s)}{P_{x + \tilde{b}(\lambda)}(s)} \right) \right| \leq 8 \left(\frac{6d}{\delta} \right)^{2d} + 2 \left(\frac{6d}{\delta} \right)^d \leq 10 \left(\frac{6d}{\delta} \right)^{2d}.$$

Together with (21.32), (21.33), (21.5), (21.9), (21.11), (21.7), and (21.39) we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
|F(0)| &\leq 4 \left(\frac{6d}{\delta} \right)^d \frac{\epsilon}{B_2!} \delta^{B_2} = \frac{4(6d)^d}{B_2!} \epsilon \delta^{B_2 - d} \\
&\leq 4\epsilon \left(\frac{\delta}{6d} \right)^{dB_1} \leq \frac{1}{50d} \left(\frac{\delta}{6d} \right)^d < \frac{2\eta}{5}, \qquad (21.51) \\
\|DF(x) - I\| &\leq d \left(\sum_{j=0}^{B_2 - 1} \frac{10\epsilon}{j!} + \frac{\epsilon}{B_2!} \delta^{B_2} 10 \left(\frac{6d}{\delta} \right)^{2d} \right) \\
&\leq \epsilon d \left(30 + 10 \left(\frac{\delta}{6d} \right)^{d(B_1 - 1)} \right) \leq 40\epsilon d \leq \frac{1}{5}. \qquad (21.52)
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 21.1 can hence be applied and we obtain $y \in \mathbb{C}^d$, $|y| < \eta = \frac{1}{4d}\left(\frac{\delta}{6d}\right)^d$, solving $F(y) = 0$. Setting $b(\lambda) := y + \tilde{b}(\lambda)$ it is clear from (21.49), (21.50) that $G(b(\lambda), \lambda) = 0$. So far we have defined $b(\lambda)$ pointwise for each $\lambda \in U_\rho(0)$. The analytic dependence of b on λ follows from the analyticity of G by a standard implicit function theorem. This completes the proof of claim 3.

By a slight abuse of notation we set

$$Q(z, \lambda) := Q(b(\lambda), z, \lambda), \tag{21.53}$$

with the function b as defined in claim 3. From (21.45) and claim 3 it is clear that we have found a representation of f of the desired form (21.16), satisfying (21.18). Observe that the realness condition on a_j and r imply that $G(b, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for $b \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathbb{R}^d$, $\lambda \in U_\rho(0) \cap \mathbb{R}^{2\nu}$, proving (21.20). In the remaining two steps we will verify (21.17) and (21.19).

Claim 4: *$|Q(z, \lambda)| \leq 1/10$ for all $|z| < \delta/4$ and $|\lambda| < \rho$.*

Proof of claim 4: It follows from (21.46), (21.35), (21.30), (21.32), $\delta/2 < \alpha < \delta$, (21.43), (21.9), (21.11), (21.7) that for $|z| < \delta/4$, $|\lambda| < \rho$

$$\begin{aligned} |Q(z, \lambda)| &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{B_2 - 1} \frac{\epsilon}{j!} 4 + \frac{\epsilon}{B_2!} \delta^{B_2} 2 \left(\frac{6d}{\delta}\right)^d \frac{4}{\delta} \cdot \alpha \\ &\leq \epsilon \left(12 + \frac{8(6d)^d}{B_2!} \delta^{B_2 - d}\right) \\ &\leq \epsilon \left(12 + 8\left(\frac{\delta}{6d}\right)^{dB_1}\right) \leq 20\epsilon < \frac{1}{10}. \end{aligned} \tag{21.54}$$

Claim 4 is verified.

Claim 5: *For $0 \leq j < d$, $|\lambda| < \rho$ and $1 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq B_1$ the following holds:*

$$\left|\partial^\beta b_j(\lambda)\right| \leq \left(\frac{5}{2} C\right)^{2|\beta|_1 - 1} (d + B_1)^{|\beta|_1^2}.$$

Proof of claim 5: From the definition of p_b and q_k in (21.21) and (21.23) we conclude that for $|s| \leq 1$ and $|b| \leq 1/(2d)$

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\partial_b^\beta \frac{q_k(b, s)}{p_b(s)}\right| &\leq |q_k(b, s)| \left|\partial_b^\beta \frac{1}{p_b(s)}\right| + \sum_{k < l < d, \beta_l > 0} \beta_l \left|\partial_b^{\beta - e_l} \frac{1}{p_b(s)}\right| \\ &\leq 2|\beta|_1! \frac{1}{|p_b(s)|^{|\beta|_1 + 1}} + |\beta|_1! \frac{1}{|p_b(s)|^{|\beta|_1}} \leq \frac{|\beta|_1!}{|p_b(s)|^{|\beta|_1}} \left(\frac{2}{|p_b(s)|} + 1\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using in addition (21.47), (21.36), (21.30) – (21.33),(21.6), (21.43), (21.9), (21.11), and (21.8) this implies for multi-indices $\beta = (\beta_b, \beta_\lambda)$ with $1 \le |\beta|_1 \le B_1$, $|\lambda| < \rho$ and $|b| \le 1/(2d)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \left|(\partial^\beta R)(b,\lambda)\right| &\le \sum_{j=0}^{B_2-1} \left|(\partial^{\beta_\lambda} c_j)(\lambda)\right| \oint_{|s|=1} |\beta_b|_1!|p_b(s)|^{-|\beta_b|_1} \left(\frac{2}{|p_b(s)|}+1\right)\frac{d|s|}{2\pi} \\ &+ \oint_{|s|=\alpha} \left|(\partial_\lambda^{\beta_\lambda}\tilde{r})(s,\lambda)\right| |\beta_b|_1!|p_b(s)|^{-|\beta_b|_1} \left(\frac{2}{|p_b(s)|}+1\right)\frac{d|s|}{2\pi} \\ &\le 3C^*(B_1!)2^{B_1}5 + \frac{\delta^{B_2}C^*}{B_2!}(B_1!)3\alpha\left(2\left(\frac{6d}{\delta}\right)^d\right)^{B_1+1} \\ &\le C^*B_1!\left(15\cdot 2^{B_1} + 3\cdot 2^{B_1+1}\right) \le C. \end{aligned} \tag{21.55}$$

For $p \in \mathbb{N}$ set

$$C(p) := (2.5C)^{2p-1}(d+B_1)^{p^2}. \tag{21.56}$$

We conclude the proof by showing that for $1 \le |\beta|_1 \le B_1$ we have

$$|\partial^\beta b(\lambda)| \le C(|\beta|_1) \quad \text{for } \lambda \in U_\rho(0). \tag{21.57}$$

The proof of (21.57) proceeds by induction on $p \equiv |\beta|_1$.

$\underline{p=1}$: Differentiating

$$b(\lambda) - a(\lambda) - R(b(\lambda),\lambda) = 0 \tag{21.58}$$

with respect to λ_l ,$1 \le l \le 2\nu$ yields

$$(I - (D_bR))(\partial_{\lambda_l} b) = \partial_{\lambda_l} a + \partial_{\lambda_l} R.$$

Since $D_bR = I - D_bG = I - DF$ we learn from (21.52) that $\|D_bR(b(\lambda),\lambda)\| \le 1/5$ for all $\lambda \in U_\rho(0)$. Using in addition (21.55) and (21.14) we conclude

$$|\partial_{\lambda_l} b| \le \frac{5}{4}(C+C) = 2.5C \le C(1). \tag{21.59}$$

$\underline{p-1 \to p}$: Let β be a multi-index of order p with $2 \le p \le B_1$. Applying ∂^β to (21.58) we obtain with proposition 24.25 ($d_1 = 2\nu$, $d_2 = d_3 = d$)

$$(I - (D_bR))(\partial^\beta b) = \partial^\beta a + \sum_{s\in S_0(\beta)} \left(\partial^{\gamma^{(s)}} R\right) \prod_{l=1}^{l^{(s)}} \partial^{\beta_l^{(s)}} b_{i_l^{(s)}}, \tag{21.60}$$

where $\#S_0(\beta) \leq (d+B_1)^p$, and for all $s \in S_0(\beta)$ we have $1 \leq |\gamma^{(s)}|_1 \leq p$, $1 \leq |\beta_l^{(s)}|_1 \leq p-1$ and $\sum_{1 \leq l \leq l^{(s)}} |\beta_l^{(s)}|_1 \leq p$. Using again that $\|D_b R\| \leq 1/5$ conclude with (21.14), (21.55)

$$|\partial^\beta b| \leq \frac{5}{4}\left[C + (d+B_1)^p C \cdot \left(\max_{s \in S_0(\beta)} \prod_{l=1}^{l^{(s)}} C(|\beta_l^{(s)}|_1)\right)\right]. \tag{21.61}$$

To estimate the maximum appearing in (21.61) observe that for $p_1 + \ldots + p_k = p$ with $1 \leq p_l \leq p-1$ for $1 \leq l \leq k$ we have

$$C(p_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot C(p_k) \leq (2.5C)^{2p-2}(d+B_1)^{p^2-2(p-1)}.$$

Since $C \geq 1$ (see (21.6), (21.8)) we find

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial^\beta b| &\leq \frac{5}{4}C\left(1 + (d+B_1)^p (2.5C)^{2p-2}(d+B_1)^{p^2-2(p-1)}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{5}{2}C(d+B_1)^p(2.5C)^{2p-2}(d+B_1)^{p^2-2(p-1)} \leq C(p). \end{aligned} \tag{21.62}$$

The induction is complete. Claim 5 and hence lemma 21.4 are proven.

□

22 An excision lemma

Our estimates on the measure of the set of resonant parameters use the following elementary lemma.

Lemma 22.1 *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $J \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval and assume that $g : J \to \mathbb{R}$ is k-times continuously differentiable. Suppose further that there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ with*

$$\left|g^{(k)}(x)\right| \geq k!\delta^k \quad \text{for all } x \in J, \tag{22.2}$$

where $g^{(k)}$ denotes the k-th derivative of g. For $t > 0$ define $I_t := \{x \in J : |g(x)| < t\}$.

Then the set I_t is a union of at most k intervals of total length $|I_t| \leq \frac{2k}{\delta} t^{\frac{1}{k}}$.

Proof. We prove the lemma inductively by showing that for each $0 \leq l \leq k$ the following holds:

(a) The function $g^{(k-l)}$ has at most l zeros.

(b) The set $I^{(l)} := \{x \in J : |g^{(k-l)}(x)| < \frac{k!}{l!}\delta^{k-l} t^{l/k}\}$ is a union of at most l intervals of total length $\leq \frac{2l}{\delta} t^{\frac{1}{k}}$.

$\underline{l = 0:}$ Statements (a) and (b) follow from the hypothesis of the lemma.

$\underline{l-1 \to l \text{ for } 1 \leq l \leq k:}$ Without loss of generality we may assume that $J \neq \emptyset$. Denote $x_0 := \inf J$ and $x_l := \sup J$. By induction hypothesis (a) we can find points $x_1, \ldots, x_{l-1} \in J$ such that the corresponding intervals $J_s := (x_{s-1}, x_s)$, $1 \leq s \leq l$ contain no zero of $g^{(k-l+1)}$. Hence $g^{(k-l)}$ is a strictly monotone function in each of the intervals $J \cap \overline{J_s}$, $1 \leq s \leq l$. This proves (a). Furthermore, for each $1 \leq s \leq l$, the set

$$I_s^{(l)} := \{x \in J \cap \overline{J_s} : |g^{(k-l)}(x)| < \frac{k!}{l!}\delta^{k-l}t^{l/k}\}$$

is a (possibly empty) interval. Hence $I^{(l)} = \bigcup_{s=1}^{l} I_s^{(l)}$ is a union of at most l intervals. In order to estimate the length of $I_s^{(l)}$ we use the lower bound on $|g^{(k-l+1)}|$ outside $I^{(l-1)}$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left|I_s^{(l)}\right| &\leq \frac{2\frac{k!}{l!}\delta^{k-l}t^{l/k}}{\frac{k!}{(l-1)!}\delta^{k-l+1}t^{(l-1)/k}} + \left|J_s \cap I^{(l-1)}\right| \\ &\leq \frac{2t^{1/k}}{l\delta} + \left|J_s \cap I^{(l-1)}\right| \end{aligned} \tag{22.3}$$

Using (22.3) and the induction hypothesis the total length of $I^{(l)}$ can be bounded by

$$\left|I^{(l)}\right| \leq \frac{2t^{1/k}}{\delta} + \left|I^{(l-1)}\right| \leq \frac{2l}{\delta}t^{\frac{1}{k}}.$$

□

23 The construction of $p \ominus q$

In this section we present a resultant type construction. More precisely, for given polynomials

$$p(z) = z^{d_1} + \sum_{j<d_1} a_j z^j \in \mathbb{C}[z], \tag{23.1}$$

$$q(z) = z^{d_2} + \sum_{j<d_2} b_j z^j \in \mathbb{C}[z], \tag{23.2}$$

of degree d_1, $d_2 \geq 1$ we will construct a polynomial r of degree $d_1 d_2$ with

$$r(x-y) = R_1(x,y)p(x) + R_2(x,y)q(y), \tag{23.3}$$

where R_1, $R_2 \in \mathbb{C}[x,y]$ are polynomials in two variables. Furthermore we will obtain some information on how the coefficients of r, R_1 and R_2 depend on the coefficients of p and q. We start with a few elementary definitions and observations.

Given p and q as in (23.1), (23.2). Denote

$$K := \{\pm a_j : 0 \leq j < d_1\} \cup \{\pm b_j : 0 \leq j < d_2\}. \tag{23.4}$$

For k, $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we define the following finite subsets of $\mathbb{C}$

$$\mathcal{T}(k,l) := \left\{ f \in \mathbb{C} : f = \sum_{j=1}^{l'} \prod_{i=1}^{k} x_{i,j}; \text{ for } x_{i,j} \in \{0, \pm 1\} \cup K \text{ and } 0 \leq l' \leq l \right\}, \tag{23.5}$$

where we use the standard definition that an empty sum has value 0 and an empty product has value 1. The following two properties are immediate from definition (23.5). For k, l, m, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}(k,l) &\subset \mathcal{T}(m,n) \quad \text{if } k \leq m \text{ and } l \leq n, && (23.6) \\ \mathcal{T}(k,l) \cdot \mathcal{T}(m,n) &\subset \mathcal{T}(k+m, ln), && (23.7) \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{T}(k,l) \cdot \mathcal{T}(m,n) = \{f \cdot g : f \in \mathcal{T}(k,l), g \in \mathcal{T}(m,n)\}$.

Proposition 23.8 *Let p, $q \in \mathbb{C}[z]$ be given as in (23.1), (23.2) with degrees d_1, $d_2 \geq 1$ and let $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then there exist unique polynomials g_s, h_s, v_s, w_s of degrees* $\deg(g_s) \leq s$, $\deg(h_s) \leq s$, $\deg(v_s) < d_1$, $\deg(w_s) < d_2$ *and*

$$\begin{aligned} z^s &= g_s(z)p(z) + v_s(z), && (23.9) \\ z^s &= h_s(z)q(z) + w_s(z). && (23.10) \end{aligned}$$

The coefficients of g_s, h_s, v_s, w_s all lie in the set $\mathcal{T}(s, 2^s)$.

Proof. We only need to proof the result for the polynomial p. The unique existence of g_s and v_s satisfying (23.9) and $\deg(g_s) \leq s$, $\deg(v_s) < d_1$ is obvious. Denote

$$\begin{aligned} g_s(z) &= \sum_{k=0}^{s} g_k^{(s)} z^k, \\ v_s(z) &= \sum_{k=0}^{d_1-1} v_k^{(s)} z^k. \end{aligned}$$

We show that $g_k^{(s)}$, $v_k^{(s)} \in \mathcal{T}(s, 2^s)$ by an induction in s.

$s = 0$: Obviously, $g_0^{(0)} = 0$, $v_0^{(0)} = 1$ and $v_k^{(0)} = 0$ for $1 \leq k < d_1$. By (23.5) all coefficients lie in $\mathcal{T}(0,1)$.

$\underline{s \to s+1:}$ The induction hypothesis yields

$$z^{s+1} = \left(\sum_{k=0}^{s} g_k^{(s)} z^{k+1}\right) p(z) + \sum_{k=0}^{d_1-2} v_k^{(s)} z^{k+1} + v_{d_1-1}^{(s)} z^{d_1}.$$

Applying (23.1) to the last term in the sum we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} g_k^{(s+1)} &= \begin{cases} v_{d_1-1}^{(s)} & \text{if } k = 0, \\ g_{k-1}^{(s)} & \text{if } 1 \le k \le s+1, \end{cases} \\ v_k^{(s+1)} &= \begin{cases} -a_0 v_{d_1-1}^{(s)} & \text{if } k = 0, \\ v_{k-1}^{(s)} - a_k v_{d_1-1}^{(s)} & \text{if } 1 \le k < d_1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The claim $g_k^{(s+1)}$, $v_k^{(s+1)} \in \mathcal{T}(s+1, 2^{s+1})$ now follows from the induction hypothesis, (23.6) and from definition (23.5). □

Lemma 23.11 *Let p, $q \in \mathbb{C}[z]$ be given as in (23.1), (23.2) with degrees d_1, $d_2 \ge 1$. Then there exist polynomials $r \in \mathbb{C}[z]$, R_1, $R_2 \in \mathbb{C}[x,y]$ satisfying*

$$r(x-y) = R_1(x,y)p(x) + R_2(x,y)q(y), \tag{23.12}$$

$$\deg(r) = d_1 d_2, \quad \textit{and the leading coefficient of } r \textit{ equals } 1\ , \tag{23.13}$$

$$\deg(R_1) < d_1 d_2, \deg(R_2) < d_1 d_2, \tag{23.14}$$

$$\textit{the coefficients of } r \textit{ lie in } \mathcal{T}\left(d_1 + d_2, 2^{d_1+d_2}[(d_1 d_2)!]\right), \tag{23.15}$$

$$\textit{the coefficients of } R_1, R_2 \textit{ lie in } \mathcal{T}(\tilde{d}, 4^{\tilde{d}}\tilde{d}!), \quad \textit{where } \tilde{d} := (d_1+1)(d_2+1). \tag{23.16}$$

Proof. Set $V := \mathbb{C}[x,y]/(p(x)\mathbb{C}[x,y]+q(y)\mathbb{C}[x,y])$. The quotient V is a vector space of (complex) dimension $d_1 d_2$ with basis $e_{i,j} := x^i y^j$, $0 \le i < d_1$, $0 \le j < d_2$. We define the linear map

$$A : V \to V, \ \ (Ag)(x,y) = (x-y)g(x,y). \tag{23.17}$$

We set r to be the characteristic polynomial of A

$$r(z) := \det(z - A). \tag{23.18}$$

Then r is a polynomial of degree $d_1 d_2$ with leading coefficient 1 and the theorem of Cayley-Hamilton implies that $r(A)e_{0,0} = 0$ in V. This means

$$r(x-y) \in p(x)\mathbb{C}[x,y] + q(y)\mathbb{C}[x,y]. \tag{23.19}$$

Hence there exist R_1, $R_2 \in \mathbb{C}[x,y]$ satisfying (23.12) and (23.13). Observe that R_1 and R_2 are not uniquely defined. However, in order to show (23.14) and (23.16) we will now make a special choice for R_1 and R_2 using the notation introduced in proposition 23.8. Write

$$r(z) = \sum_{s=0}^{d_1 d_2} c_s z^s = z^{d_1 d_2} + \sum_{s<d_1 d_2} c_s z^s \tag{23.20}$$

and note that

$$\begin{aligned}
(x-y)^s &= \sum_{l=0}^{s} \begin{pmatrix} s \\ l \end{pmatrix} (-1)^{s-l} x^l y^{s-l} \\
&= \left(\sum_{l=0}^{s} \begin{pmatrix} s \\ l \end{pmatrix} (-1)^{s-l} g_l(x) y^{s-l} \right) p(x) \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{l=0}^{s} \begin{pmatrix} s \\ l \end{pmatrix} (-1)^{s-l} v_l(x) h_{s-l}(y) \right) q(y) \\
&\quad + \sum_{l=0}^{s} \begin{pmatrix} s \\ l \end{pmatrix} (-1)^{s-l} v_l(x) w_{s-l}(y).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from $\deg(v_l) < d_1$, $\deg(w_{s-l}) < d_2$ and from (23.19) that

$$\sum_{s=0}^{d_1 d_2} c_s \sum_{l=0}^{s} \begin{pmatrix} s \\ l \end{pmatrix} (-1)^{s-l} v_l(x) w_{s-l}(y) = 0.$$

Thus we obtain a representation of the form (23.12), satisfying (23.13) and (23.14) by setting

$$R_1(x,y) = \sum_{s=0}^{d_1 d_2} \sum_{l=0}^{s} c_s \begin{pmatrix} s \\ l \end{pmatrix} (-1)^{s-l} g_l(x) y^{s-l}, \tag{23.21}$$

$$R_2(x,y) = \sum_{s=0}^{d_1 d_2} \sum_{l=0}^{s} c_s \begin{pmatrix} s \\ l \end{pmatrix} (-1)^{s-l} v_l(x) h_{s-l}(y). \tag{23.22}$$

In order to prove (23.15) we determine the entries of the matrix $z - A$ when expressed with respect to the basis $(e_{i,j})$. We compute $(z-A)e_{i,j} =$

$$\begin{array}{rl}
z e_{i,j} - e_{i+1,j} + e_{i,j+1} & \text{if } i < d_1 - 1, j < d_2 - 1, \\
(z + a_{d_1-1}) e_{i,j} + \sum_{l=0}^{d_1-2} a_l e_{l,j} + e_{i,j+1} & \text{if } i = d_1 - 1, j < d_2 - 1, \\
(z - b_{d_2-1}) e_{i,j} - e_{i+1,j} - \sum_{l=0}^{d_2-2} b_l e_{i,l} & \text{if } i < d_1 - 1, j = d_2 - 1,
\end{array}$$

$$(z + a_{d_1-1} - b_{d_2-1})e_{i,j} + \sum_{l=0}^{d_1-2} a_l e_{l,j} - \sum_{l=0}^{d_2-2} b_l e_{i,l} \qquad \text{if } i = d_1 - 1, j = d_2 - 1.$$

Observe that all entries of $z - A$ are contained in the set

$$\{0, 1, -1\} \cup K \cup \{z, z + a_{d_1-1}, z - b_{d_2-1}, z + a_{d_1-1} - b_{d_2-1}\}.$$

Expanding the determinant of $z - A$ in a sum of products and multiplying out the diagonal entries $z + a_{d_1-1}$, $z - b_{d_2-1}$ and $z + a_{d_1-1} - b_{d_2-1}$ one sees easily that the coefficients c_s, $0 \le s < d_1 d_2$ of the characteristic polynomial r satisfy

$$c_s \in \mathcal{T}(d_1 + d_2 - 1, 3 \cdot 2^{d_1+d_2-2}[(d_1 d_2)!]). \tag{23.23}$$

This proves (23.15) (see (23.6)). Finally, using (23.21), (23.22), (23.23), proposition 23.8, (23.7), and (23.6) we conclude that the coefficients of R_1, R_2 lie in the set

$$\mathcal{T}\left(d_1 d_2 + d_1 + d_2 - 1, (d_1 d_2 + 1)2^{d_1 d_2} \cdot 3 \cdot 2^{d_1+d_2-2}[(d_1 d_2)!]2^{d_1 d_2}\right),$$

proving (23.16). ◻

Definition 23.24 *Given p, $q \in \mathbb{C}[z]$ as in (23.1), (23.2) with d_1, $d_2 \ge 1$. Then we denote by $p \ominus q$ the polynomial r as defined through (23.17), (23.18) in the proof of lemma 23.11.*

Remark 23.25 *The following example shows that for given polynomials p and q (as in (23.1), (23.2)) the polynomial r is not necessarily uniquely defined by (23.12) and (23.13). In fact, set $p(z) = q(z) = z^2$ and define A as in (23.17). One checks easily that $A^3 = 0$ and hence for $r(z) = z^4 + cz^3$ a representation of the form (23.12) can be found for all $c \in \mathbb{C}$.*

24 Remarks on the higher order chain rule

In this section we collect those specialized versions of the higher order chain rule which are used in the paper. We formulate them for functions which are defined on open subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and which satisfy some finite regularity assumptions. Of course, the formulae also hold in the case of analytic functions defined on open subsets of $\mathbb{C}^d$.

Proposition 24.1 *Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open set and let X and Y be Banach spaces. Assume that $V \subset X$ is an open set and that $f : U \to V$ and $g : V \to Y$ are C^s – functions with $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$h := g \circ f : U \to Y$ is also s-times continuously differentiable. For multi-indices β with $1 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq s$ and $\lambda \in U$,

$$\partial^\beta h(\lambda) = \sum_{k=1}^{|\beta|_1} \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_k = \beta \\ \alpha_i \neq 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k}} \frac{\beta!}{\alpha_1! \ldots \alpha_k!} (D^k g)(f(\lambda))[\partial^{\alpha_1} f(\lambda), \ldots, \partial^{\alpha_k} f(\lambda)]. \tag{24.2}$$

Proof. We prove (24.2) by calculating the corresponding term in the Taylor-expansion of h. Observe first that for λ, $\mu \in U$,

$$f(\mu) - f(\lambda) = \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq s} \frac{1}{\alpha!} (\partial^\alpha f)(\lambda)(\mu - \lambda)^\alpha + o(|\mu - \lambda|^s). \tag{24.3}$$

Furthermore,

$$g(v) - g(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{s} \frac{1}{k!} (D^k g)(x)[v - x, \ldots, v - x] + o(|v - x|_X^s). \tag{24.4}$$

From (24.3) and (24.4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& h(\mu) - h(\lambda) \\
= \; & \sum_{k=1}^{s} \frac{1}{k!} (D^k g)(f(\lambda)) \left[\sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq s} \frac{1}{\alpha!} (\partial^\alpha f)(\lambda)(\mu - \lambda)^\alpha, \ldots, \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq s} \frac{1}{\alpha!} (\partial^\alpha f)(\lambda)(\mu - \lambda)^\alpha \right] \\
& + o(|\mu - \lambda|^s) \\
= \; & \sum_{1 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq s} c_\beta(\lambda)(\mu - \lambda)^\beta + o(|\mu - \lambda|^s), \qquad \text{where} \\
c_\beta(\lambda) \; := \; & \sum_{k=1}^{|\beta|_1} \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_k = \beta \\ \alpha_i \neq 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k}} \frac{1}{\alpha_1! \ldots \alpha_k!} (D^k g)(f(\lambda))[\partial^{\alpha_1} f(\lambda), \ldots, \partial^{\alpha_k} f(\lambda)].
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (24.2). □

To estimate the number of terms in (24.2) the following identity is useful.

Proposition 24.5 *Let k, $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^r$ be a multi-index. Then*

$$\sum_{\alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_k = \beta} \frac{\beta!}{\alpha_1! \ldots \alpha_k!} = k^{|\beta|_1}. \tag{24.6}$$

Proof. Applying the formula for multinomials we obtain for k, $s \in \mathbb{N}$

$$k^s = (1 + \ldots + 1)^s = \sum_{a_1 + \ldots + a_k = s} \frac{s!}{a_1! \cdot \ldots \cdot a_k!}. \tag{24.7}$$

Furthermore, $k^{|\beta|_1} = k^{\beta_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot k^{\beta_r}$. Applying (24.7) to each of the the factors k^{β_i}, $1 \leq i \leq r$, yields (24.6). □

24.1 Higher derivatives of DW

We use the notation of section 18. The following is an immediate consequence of proposition 24.1.

Corollary 24.8 *Let W be defined as in section 18 with respect to some real power series $\sum \alpha_k y^k$ with positive radius of convergence $0 < r \leq \infty$. Assume further that $u : U \to X$ is a C^∞ function, where U is some open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $(X, |\cdot|)$ is a Banach space, and $|u(\lambda)| < r$ for all $\lambda \in U$. Set $R(\lambda) := DW(u(\lambda))$, then for $v \in X$*

$$(\partial_\lambda^\beta R)v = \sum_{k=1}^{|\beta|_1} \sum_{\substack{\beta_1 + \ldots + \beta_k = \beta \\ \beta_i \neq 0 \ \ for \ \ 1 \leq i \leq k}} \frac{1}{k!} \frac{\beta!}{\beta_1! \ldots \beta_k!} (D^{k+1}W)(u)[\partial^{\beta_1} u, \ldots, \partial^{\beta_k} u, v]. \tag{24.9}$$

24.2 Derivatives of inverse matrices

Corollary 24.10 *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a Banach algebra with unity. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open set and assume that G, $H : U \to \mathcal{B}$ are C^s – maps, such that $H^{-1}(\lambda)$ exists in $\mathcal{B}$ for all $\lambda \in U$. Then for $1 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq s$,*

(a)

$$\partial^\beta (H^{-1}) = \sum_{k=1}^{|\beta|_1} (-1)^k \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_k = \beta \\ \alpha_i \neq 0 \ for \ 1 \leq i \leq k}} \frac{\beta!}{\alpha_1! \ldots \alpha_k!} H^{-1}(\partial^{\alpha_1} H) H^{-1} \ldots H^{-1}(\partial^{\alpha_k} H) H^{-1}$$

(b)

$$\partial^\beta (GH^{-1}) = \sum_{k=1}^{|\beta|_1+1} (-1)^{k-1} \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_k = \beta \\ \alpha_i \neq 0 \ for \ 2 \leq i \leq k}} \frac{\beta!}{\alpha_1! \ldots \alpha_k!} (\partial^{\alpha_1} G) H^{-1}(\partial^{\alpha_2} H) H^{-1} \ldots H^{-1}(\partial^{\alpha_k} H) H^{-1}$$

Proof. To prove (a) it is convenient to repeat the proof of Proposition 24.1 where one replaces (24.4) by the Neumann series

$$V^{-1} - X^{-1} = -X^{-1}(V - X)X^{-1} + X^{-1}(V - X)X^{-1}(V - X)X^{-1} \mp \ldots.$$

Claim (b) follows from (a) via the Leibniz rule. □

Proposition 24.11 *Let $(\mathcal{B}, \|\cdot\|)$ be a Banach algebra with unity e and let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open set. Assume that $A,\ X : U \to \mathcal{B}$ are C^s – maps, $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and $A^{-1}(\lambda)$ exists for all $\lambda \in U$. Suppose further that there exist constants $\epsilon > 0$, $M \geq 1$, $C \geq 1$, satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial^\beta A^{-1}(\lambda)\| &\leq MC^{|\beta|_1} \quad \textit{for } \lambda \in U,\ 0 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq s, && (24.12) \\ \|\partial^\beta X(\lambda)\| &\leq \epsilon C^{|\beta|_1} \quad \textit{for } \lambda \in U,\ 0 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq s, && (24.13) \\ \epsilon M &\leq \frac{1}{2}. && (24.14) \end{aligned}$$

Then $(A+X)(\lambda)$ is invertible in $\mathcal{B}$ for all $\lambda \in U$ and

$$\|\partial^\beta (A+X)^{-1}(\lambda)\| \leq 2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^{|\beta|_1+1} k^{|\beta|_1} \|e\|^k \right) M(2C)^{|\beta|_1} \quad \textit{for } \lambda \in U,\ 0 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq s. \tag{24.15}$$

Proof. From condition (24.14) it follows that $\|XA^{-1}\| \leq 1/2$. Therefore we can invert $S := e + XA^{-1}$ by a Neumann series. Keeping in mind that $\|e\| \geq 1$ (by sub-multiplicativity of the norm) we obtain that

$$\|S^{-1}\| \leq \|e\| + 1 \leq 2\|e\|. \tag{24.16}$$

Furthermore, we can express

$$(A+X)^{-1} = A^{-1}S^{-1}. \tag{24.17}$$

We have thus proved (24.15) for $\beta = 0$. In order to estimate derivatives of $(A+X)^{-1}$ we use the Leibniz rule, (24.12) – (24.14), proposition 24.5 and find for $1 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq s$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial^\beta S\| &\leq \sum_{\alpha \leq \beta} \frac{\beta!}{\alpha!(\beta-\alpha)!} \|\partial^\alpha X\| \|\partial^{\beta-\alpha} A^{-1}\| \\ &\leq \sum_{\alpha \leq \beta} \frac{\beta!}{\alpha!(\beta-\alpha)!} \epsilon M C^{|\beta|_1} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(2C)^{|\beta|_1}. && (24.18) \end{aligned}$$

We apply (24.17), Corollary 24.10, (24.12), (24.16), (24.18) and proposition 24.5 to obtain for $1 \leq |\beta|_1 \leq s$ the following estimates.

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial^\beta (A+X)^{-1}\| &= \|\partial^\beta (A^{-1}S^{-1})\| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{|\beta|_1+1} \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_k = \beta \\ \alpha_i \neq 0 \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq k}} \frac{\beta!}{\alpha_1! \ldots \alpha_k!} MC^{|\alpha_1|_1} (2\|e\|)^k \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{k-1} (2C)^{|\alpha_2|_1 + \ldots + |\alpha_k|_1} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^{|\beta|_1+1} \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1+\ldots+\alpha_k=\beta \\ \alpha_i \neq 0 \text{ for } 2\leq i\leq k}} \frac{\beta!}{\alpha_1!\ldots\alpha_k!} M(2C)^{|\beta|_1} 2\|e\|^k$$

$$\leq 2\sum_{k=1}^{|\beta|_1+1} k^{|\beta|_1}\|e\|^k M(2C)^{|\beta|_1}.$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 24.11. □

24.3 The chain rule in a special case

The goal of this section is to make the multi-linear form $D^k g$ which appears in formula (24.2) more explicit in a special case. Before we state our proposition we introduce the following notation. For $f : U \to X$ smooth ($U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ open, X a Banach space), and a multi-index $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ we denote

$$f^{[\beta]} := \frac{1}{\beta!}\partial^\beta f. \tag{24.19}$$

Proposition 24.20 *Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $V \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be open sets and let $f : U \to V$, $p : V \to \mathbb{R}$ be C^s – functions. Then the composition $g = p \circ f$ is also a C^s – function with*

$$g^{[s]} = \sum_{1\leq|\alpha|_1\leq s} (p^{[\alpha]} \circ f) \sum_{\substack{\delta^i \in \mathbb{N}^{\alpha_i} \textit{ for } 1\leq i\leq d \\ \sum_i |\delta^i|_1 = s}} \prod_{i=1}^{d}\prod_{j=1}^{\alpha_i} f_i^{[\delta^i_j]}. \tag{24.21}$$

Remark 24.22 In formula (24.21) we need to clarify the notation $\delta^i \in \mathbb{N}^{\alpha_i}$, if $\alpha_i = 0$. In this case we understand $|\delta^i|_1 = 0$ and use the standard convention for the empty product

$$\prod_{j=1}^{\alpha_i} f_i^{[\delta^i_j]} = 1.$$

Proof. One could derive proposition 24.20 from proposition 24.1. However, it is more convenient to give a direct proof via Taylor expansion. In fact, proposition 24.20 is a consequence of the expansions (24.23) and (24.24) below. For τ, $t \in U$

$$\begin{aligned} p(f(\tau)) - p(f(t)) &= \sum_{1\leq|\alpha|_1\leq s} p^{[\alpha]}(f(t))(f(\tau)-f(t))^\alpha + o(|f(\tau)-f(t)|^s) \\ &= \sum_{1\leq|\alpha|_1\leq s} p^{[\alpha]}(f(t))\prod_{i=1}^{d}(f_i(\tau)-f_i(t))^{\alpha_i} + o(|\tau-t|^s), \end{aligned} \tag{24.23}$$

$$f_i(\tau) - f_i(t) = \sum_{p=1}^{s} f_i^{[p]}(\tau-t)^p + o(|\tau-t|^s). \tag{24.24}$$

□

24.4 Differentiating implicitly defined functions

Proposition 24.25 *Let k, d_1, d_2, $d_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$, $V \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ be open sets. Suppose further that $f : U \to V$, $x \mapsto f(x)$ and $g : V \times U \to \mathbb{R}^{d_3}$, $(y,x) \mapsto g(y,x)$ are C^k – functions. Then $G : U \to \mathbb{R}^{d_3}$, $G(x) := g(f(x),x)$ is again a C^k – function and the derivatives $\partial^\beta G$, $1 \le |\beta|_1 \le k$, can be written in the following form.*

$$\partial^\beta G = \sum_{i=1}^{d_2} (\partial_{y_i} g)\, \partial^\beta f_i + \sum_{s \in S_0(\beta)} \left(\partial^{\gamma^{(s)}} g\right) \cdot \prod_{l=1}^{l^{(s)}} \partial^{\alpha_l^{(s)}} f_{i_l^{(s)}}, \tag{24.26}$$

where

$$S_0(\beta) \ \text{ is a set of cardinality } \ \#S_0(\beta) \le (d_2 + |\beta|_1)^{|\beta|_1} - d_2, \tag{24.27}$$

$$1 \le |\gamma^{(s)}|_1 \le |\beta|_1 \quad \text{for } \ s \in S_0(\beta), \tag{24.28}$$

$$0 \le l^{(s)} \le |\beta|_1 \quad \text{for } \ s \in S_0(\beta), \tag{24.29}$$

$$1 \le |\alpha_l^{(s)}|_1 \le |\beta|_1 - 1 \quad \text{for } \ s \in S_0(\beta) \ \text{ and } \ 1 \le l \le l^{(s)}, \tag{24.30}$$

$$\sum_{l=1}^{l^{(s)}} |\alpha_l^{(s)}|_1 \le |\beta|_1 \quad \text{for } \ s \in S_0(\beta). \tag{24.31}$$

Proof. We prove proposition 24.25 by induction on $|\beta|_1$. The case $|\beta|_1 = 1$ is straight forward to verify. Suppose that (24.26) holds for some $1 \le |\beta|_1 \le k-1$ and denote $\partial^\beta G = A(\beta) + B(\beta)$, where $A(\beta)$ and $B(\beta)$ denote the sums in (24.26). Let $1 \le m \le d_1$. Then $\partial^{\beta+e_m} G = \partial^{e_m} A(\beta) + \partial^{e_m} B(\beta)$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial^{e_m} A(\beta) &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_2} (\partial_{y_i} g)\, \partial^{\beta+e_m} f_i\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{d_2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{d_2} \left(\partial_{y_j} \partial_{y_i} g\right) \partial^{e_m} f_j + (\partial_{x_m} \partial_{y_i} g)\right) \partial^\beta f_i \\
&= I + II.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $I = A(\beta + e_m)$, whereas II contributes $d_2(d_2+1)$ terms to $B(\beta+e_m)$ which satisfy conditions (24.28) – (24.31) with respect to $\beta + e_m$ (note that $|\beta + e_m|_1 \ge 2$). It is not difficult to see that $\partial^{e_m} B(\beta)$ is a sum of at most $\#S_0(\beta) \cdot (d_2 + 1 + |\beta|_1)$ terms where each summand again satisfies (24.28) – (24.31) with respect to $\beta + e_m$. Using again $|\beta|_1 \ge 1$ we conclude that $\partial^{\beta+e_m} G$ can be written in the form (24.26) and the corresponding conditions (24.27) – (24.31) hold. □

25 Table of notation used in chapters II and III

A, A_1	(4.13), (4.14)
b	theorem 2.19
B_0, B_1, B_2	(4.19), (4.20), (4.21)
$B_\rho(X)$, $B(X,\rho)$	(4.1)
c	(4.5)
$\mathcal{C}^{(j)}$	(4.49), (4.50)
$D(\omega)$	(3.2)
D_N	(4.6)
D_P	(4.38)
D_V, d_V	proposition 19.1
D_W	lemma 18.1
D_τ, D_K, $D_E(x)$	(4.22), (4.39), (4.23)
$d_{\tau,c}$, d_{min}, $\tilde{d}_{min}$	(4.24), (4.25), (4.26)
$D_\psi(k)$	(4.40)
D_i, $D_{i,j}$ $(1 \le i \le 4,\, 1 \le j \le 5)$	(4.27) – (4.37)
E_ρ, E_δ, E_M	(4.15), (4.16), (4.17)
F	theorem 2.19
g	(2.10)
$\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,c}$, $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,1}$	definition 5.21
M_j, $j \ge 0$	(4.48)
n_0	lemma 4.54
N_j, $j \ge 0$	(4.43), (4.44)
P	(3.6)
$\mathcal{P}$	(3.13)
$\mathcal{POL}$	(4.51)
q	(4.18)
Q	(3.5)
$\mathcal{Q}$	(3.12)
$r_{F,b}$	(4.8)
s	(2.14)
$\mathcal{S}$	(3.4)
$T^{(j)}(\lambda)$, $T^{(j)}(\theta,\lambda)$	(4.10), (4.11)
$U_\rho(Z)$, $U(Z,\rho)$	(4.2)
$V(\omega)$, $V(\theta,\omega)$, V_l	(2.16), (3.31), (4.12)

W	lemma 18.1
$w_{\sigma,c}$, $w_{\sigma,1}$	definition 5.15
$X_{\sigma,c}$, $X_{\sigma,1}$	definition 5.21
Z_C, $\tilde{Z}_C$	(3.40), (3.41)
α_k	(4.9)
γ	theorem 2.19
δ_V	proposition 19.1
δ_j, $j \geq 0$	(4.47)
κ	theorem 2.19
$\tilde{\kappa}$	(4.41)
$\lambda^{(0)}$	(3.11)
ν	(2.11)
$\pi_l^{(j)}$	(4.53)
ρ_j, $\tilde{\rho}_j$, $j \geq 0$	(4.45), (4.46)
σ_j	(4.7)
τ	(2.14)
φ	(3.9)
ψ	section 4 G)
$\omega^{(0)}$	(2.12), (2.13)
Ω	(2.15) – (2.18)
$\lvert\cdot\rvert$, $\lvert\cdot\rvert_1$, $\lvert\cdot\rvert_2$	section 4 A)
$< \cdot, \cdot >$	(4.3)
$[\cdot]$	(3.38)
$\lfloor\cdot\rfloor$	(4.4)

References

[1] M. Ablowitz, C. Clarkson. *Solitons, Nonlinear Evolution Equations and Inverse Scattering.* London Mathematical Society. Lecture Note Series **149**. Cambridge University Press, 1991.

[2] J. Baik, P. Deift, K. Johansson. *On the distribution of the length of the longest increasing subsequence of random permutations.* J. Amer. Math. Soc. **12** (1999), 1119 – 1178.

[3] J. Barrow-Green. *Poincaré and the three body problem.* History of Mathematics **11**. AMS, Providence RI, 1997.

[4] J. Bourgain. *Construction of quasi-periodic solutions for Hamiltonian perturbations of linear equations and applications to nonlinear PDE.* Internat. Math. Res. Notices **1994**, No. 11, 475 – 497.

[5] J. Bourgain. *On Melnikov's persistency problem.* Mathematical Research Letters **4** (1997), 445 – 458.

[6] J. Bourgain. *Quasi-periodic solutions of Hamiltonian perturbations of* $2D$ *linear Schrödinger equations.* Ann. of Math. **148** (1998), 363 – 439.

[7] F. Calogero. *Solution of the one-dimensional* N*-body problem with quadratic and/ or inversely quadratic pair potentials.* J. Math. Phys. **12** (1971), 419 – 436.

[8] W. Craig, H.-W. Su. *Persistence of periodic solutions for the nonlinear wave equation: A case of finite regularity.* Preprint (1999).

[9] W. Craig, C. E. Wayne. *Newton's method and periodic solutions of nonlinear wave equations.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **46** (1993), 1409 – 1498.

[10] W. Craig, C. E. Wayne. *Periodic solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations and the Nash-Moser method.* NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. B: Phys., **331** (1994), 103-122.

[11] P. Deift. *Applications of Riemann-Hilbert Theory to Asymptotic Problems in the Theory of Orthogonal Polynomials and in Random Matrix Theory.* Courant Lecture Notes, **3**, 1999.

[12] P. Deift, A. Its, X. Zhou. *A Riemann – Hilbert approach to asymptotic problems arising in the theory of random matrix models, and also in the theory of integrable statistical mechanics.* Ann. of Math. **146** (1997), 149 – 235.

[13] P. Deift, S. Kamvissis, T. Kriecherbauer, X. Zhou. *The Toda Rarefaction Problem.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **49** (1996), 35 – 83.

[14] P. Deift, T. Kriecherbauer, K. T-R McLaughlin, S. Venakides, X. Zhou. *Asymptotics for Polynomials Orthogonal with Respect to Varying Exponential Weights.* Internat. Math. Res. Notices **1997**, No. 16, 759 – 782.

[15] P. Deift, T. Kriecherbauer, K. T-R McLaughlin, S. Venakides, X. Zhou. *Strong Asymptotics of Orthogonal Polynomials with Respect to Exponential Weights.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. (to appear).

[16] P. Deift, T. Kriecherbauer, K. T-R McLaughlin, S. Venakides, X. Zhou. *Uniform Asymptotics for Polynomials Orthogonal with respect to Varying Exponential Weights and Applications to Universality Questions in Random Matrix Theory.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **52** (1999), 1335 – 1425.

[17] P. Deift, T. Kriecherbauer, S. Venakides. *Forced Lattice Vibrations, Part I, II.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **48** (1995), 1187 – 1249, 1251 – 1298.

[18] P. Deift, K. T-R McLaughlin. *A Continuum Limit of the Toda Lattice.* Memoirs of the AMS **624**, (1998).

[19] P. Deift, S. Venakides, X. Zhou. *New Results in Small Dispersion KdV by an Extension of the Steepest Descent Method for Riemann – Hilbert problems.* Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **95** (1998), 450 – 454.

[20] P. Deift, X. Zhou. *A steepest descent method for oscillatory Riemann – Hilbert problems. Asymptotics for the mKdV equation.* Ann. of Math. **137** (1993), 295 – 370.

[21] P. Deift, X. Zhou. *Asymptotics for the Painlevé II equation.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **48** (1995), 277 – 337.

[22] D. DeLatte. *On normal forms in Hamiltonian dynamics, a new approach to some convergence questions.* Ergodic Theory Dynamical Systems **15** (1995), 49 – 66.

[23] H. von Dreifus, A. Klein. *A new proof of localization in the Anderson tight binding model.* Comm. Math. Phys. **124** (1989), 285 – 299.

[24] L. H. Eliasson. *Perturbations of Stable Invariant Tori for Hamiltonian Systems.* Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) **15** (1988), 115 – 147.

[25] E. Fermi, J. Pasta, S. Ulam. Study of nonlinear problems. *Collected works of Enrico Fermi* Vol. II, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1965.

[26] A. Filip, S. Venakides. *Existence and modulation of traveling waves in particle chains.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **52** (1999), 693 – 735.

[27] H. Flaschka. *On the Toda Lattice I: Existence of Integrals.* Phys. Rev. B **9** (1974), 1924 – 1925.

[28] H. Flaschka. *On the Toda Lattice II: Inverse scattering solution.* Prog. Theor. Phys. **51** (1974), 703 – 716.

[29] G. Friesecke, R. L. Pego. *Solitary waves on FPU lattices I: Qualitative properties, renormalization and continuum limit.* Preprint (1998).

[30] G. Friesecke, J. A. D. Wattis. *Existence theorem for solitary waves on lattices.* Comm. Math. Phys. **161** (1994), 391 – 418.

[31] J. Fröhlich, T. Spencer. *Absence of diffusion in the Anderson tight binding model for large disorder or low energy.* Comm. Math. Phys. **88** (1983), 151 – 184.

[32] J. Fröhlich, T. Spencer, P. Wittwer. *Localization for a class of one dimensional quasi-periodic Schrödinger operators.* Comm. Math. Phys. **132** (1990), 5 – 25.

[33] C. Gardner, J. Greene, M. Kruskal, R. Miura. *Method for solving the Korteweg – de Vries equation.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **19** (1967), 1095 – 1097.

[34] A. Georgieva, T. Kriecherbauer, S. Venakides. *Wave propagation and resonance in a 1-d nonlinear discrete periodic medium.* SIAM J. Appl. Math. (to appear).

[35] A. Georgieva, T. Kriecherbauer, S. Venakides. *1:2 Resonance mediated second harmonic generation in a 1-d nonlinear discrete periodic medium.* Preprint (1999).

[36] M. Goldstein. *Anderson Localization for quasi-periodic Schrödinger equations.* Preprint.

[37] B. Holian, H. Flaschka, D. W. McLaughlin. *Shock Waves in the Toda lattice: Analysis*, Phys. Rev. A **24** (1981), 2595 – 2623.

[38] B. Holian, G. Straub. *Molecular dynamics of shock waves in one-dimensional chains.* Phys. Rev. B **18** (1978), 1593 – 1608.

[39] G. Iooss, K. Kirchgässner. *Travelling waves in a chain of coupled nonlinear oscillators.* Preprint (1999).

[40] S. Kamvissis. *On the Toda Shock Problem.* Physica D **65** (1993), 242 – 266.

[41] S. Kamvissis. *Long time behavior of the doubly infinite Toda lattice under initial data decaying at infinity.* Comm. Math. Phys. **153** (1993), 479 – 519.

[42] T. Kato. *Perturbation theory for linear operators.* Springer – Verlag, Berlin, 1966.

[43] I. M. Krichever. *Algebraic curves and non-linear difference equations.* Russian Math. Surveys **33:4** (1978), 255 – 256.

[44] T. Kriecherbauer. *Estimates on Green's functions of quasi-periodic matrix operators and a new version of the Coupling Lemma in the Fröhlich-Spencer Technique.* Internat. Math. Res. Notices, **1998**, No. 17, 907 – 935.

[45] T. Kriecherbauer, K. T-R McLaughlin. *Strong Asymptotics of Polynomials Orthogonal with Respect to Freud Weights.* Internat. Math. Res. Notices, **1999**, No. 6, 299 – 333.

[46] S. Kuksin. *Nearly integrable infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems.* Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1556**, Springer – Verlag, Berlin, 1993.

[47] S. Kuksin, J. Pöschel. *Invariant Cantor Manifolds of quasi-periodic oscillations for a nonlinear Schrödinger equation.* Ann. of Math. **143** (1996), 149 – 179.

[48] R. Larsen. *Banach Algebras.* Marcel Dekker Inc. New York, 1973.

[49] P. D. Lax, *Integrals of nonlinear equations of evolution and solitary waves.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **21** (1968), 467 – 490.

[50] J. Mallet-Paret. *The global structure of traveling waves in spatially discrete dynamical systems.* J. Dynamics Differential Equations **11** (1999), 49 – 127.

[51] S. V. Manakov. *Complete integrability and stochasitization of discrete dynamical systems.* Sov. Phys. JETP **40** (1975), 269 – 274.

[52] J. Moser. Finitely many mass points on the line under the influence of an exponential potential - an integrable system, *Dynamical Systems Theory and Applications*, ed. J. Moser, Springer – Verlag, New York, 1975, 467 – 497.

[53] J. Moser. *Three integrable Hamiltonian systems connected with isospectral deformations*. Adv. Math. **16** (1975), 197 – 220.

[54] J. Pöschel. *On elliptic lower dimensional tori in hamiltonian systems*. Math. Z. **202** (1989), 559 – 608.

[55] J. Pöschel. *On the Fröhlich-Spencer-estimate in the theory of Anderson localization*. Manuscripta Math. **70** (1990), 27 – 37.

[56] J. Pöschel. *A KAM-theorem for some nonlinear partial differential equations*. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) **23** (1996), 119 – 148.

[57] J. Pöschel. *Quasi-periodic solutions for a nonlinear wave equation*. Comment. Math. Helv. **71** (1996), 269 – 296.

[58] J. Scheurle. *Quasi-periodic solutions of the plane three-body problem near Euler's orbits*. Celestial Mechanics **28** (1982), 141 – 151.

[59] J. Scheurle. *Bifurcation of quasi-periodic solutions from equilibrium points of reversible dynamical systems*. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **97** (1987), 103 – 139.

[60] D. Smets. *Travelling waves for an infinite lattice: multibump type solutions*. Topological Methods in Nonlinear Analysis **12** (1998), 79 – 90.

[61] D. Smets, M. Willem. *Solitary waves with prescribed speed on infinite lattices*. J. Funct. Anal. **149** (1997), 266 – 275.

[62] S. Surace. *The Schrödinger equation with a quasi-periodic potential*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **320** (1990), 321 – 370.

[63] M. Toda. *Theory of nonlinear lattices*, Springer – Verlag, Berlin, 1989.

[64] M. Toda. J. Phys. Soc. Japan **22** (1967), 431.

[65] S. Venakides, P. Deift, R. Oba, *The Toda Shock Problem*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **44** (1991), 1171 – 1242.

[66] C. E. Wayne. *The KAM theory of systems with short range interactions I, II*. Comm. Math. Phys. **91** (1984), 311 – 329, 331 – 344.

[67] C. E. Wayne. *Periodic and quasi-periodic solutions of nonlinear wave equations via KAM theory*. Comm. Math. Phys. **127** (1990), 479 – 528.